Concubinage *and* Poligamy DISPROV'D: OR, THE Divine Institution of Marriage BETWIXT ONE MAN, AND One Woman only, ASSERTED.

In Answer to a Book, writ by *John Butler*, B.D. for which he was presented as follows:

We the Grand Jury, sworn to Enquire for the Body of the City of London, *on* Wednesday, *the First Day of* December, 1697. *Present one* John Butler, *for Writing and Publishing a Wicked Pamphlet; wherein he maintains Concubinage to be Lawful, and which may prove very destructive to divers Families, if not timely Suppress'd.*

Eum qui duas habet Uxores comitatur Infamia, Legi Imperial. Lib. 9. Tit. 9. Leg. 18.

Jer. 23. 14. *I have seen also in the Prophets of* Jerusalem *an horrible thing; they commit Adultery, and walk in Lies; they strengthen also the Hands of the Evil Doers, that none doth return from his Wickedness.* Ver. 15. *From the Prophets of* Jerusalem *is Prophaneness gone forth into all the Land.*

LONDON: Printed for *R. Baldwin*, in *Warwick-Lane*, 1698. Price 1 *s.*

ONE MAN
AND
One Woman only.

THE
Epistle Dedicatory.
TO
John Butler, B. D.
Asserter of the Lawfulness of Concubinage.

IT is now become usual for Authors to set off their Performances, by dedicating them to Extraordinary Patrons; and therefore I hope you will not blame me for Dedicating the following Sheets to your self. Your Book, for any thing I know, considering the Scope of it, and the Function of the Author, is unprecedented. You have been at a great deal of Pains, to write an Apology for the Modish Practice of keeping a Mist. The pre-

valency of the Custom had already abated much of it's Odium; so that there wanted nothing but your finishing Stroke, to commend it to us from the Pulpit as Sacred and Holy, which you have Generously done in your 34th Page, &c. But, good Sir, to which of the Saints will you turn, or whom shall we follow as a Patron of your Reform'd Concubinage? Adam neither had, nor was allowed any Concubine; and the first that we find upon Divine Record to have been Guilty of Poligamy, was Lamech, one of Cain's Posterity. I am afraid that the Holiness of the first Practitioner will scarcely be able to Hallow the Practice. If we come to Abraham, the Father of the Faithful, we don't find that he made use of any Concubine till his Wife advis'd him to it; and that she did not neither, till she her self was past Childbearing, by the Ordinary Course of Nature. So that if we must be restricted to the same Conditions, the Gallants will scarcely thank you for your Kindness.

In the next place, you leave us mightily in the Dark, not only as to the time when, but likewise as to the Number of Concubines we may Lawfully take. We don't find that Abraham had above one at a time, yet his Grandson Jacob had two or three: Now, pray, Sir, which of the two must be our Standard? Or what is to be the Rule of the Reform'd Concubinage you propose? Abraham and Jacob had the Consent of their Wives, and the first of them sent away his Miss, and kept his Wife. But; for you, Sir, if we may believe Martha Perkins, you have sent away your Wife, and

and kept your Miss. *Pardon me, Sir, if I take* Miss *and* Concubine *to be Synonimous Terms; for I am not Master of Logick enough to distinguish betwixt them, according to your Discription of the latter.*

But the Liberty of Poligamy, or Concubinage, is not the only thing wherein you have vindicated the Original Right of Mankind; You have put a Greater Obligation upon the Age still, by making every man a Judg in his own Cause; nay, and an Executioner too; for you have not only adjudg'd Martha Perkins *to be an unjust Desertrice, but have dispos'd of her Property at your own hand, by taking* Mary Tomkins *into her Bed, without Application either to Church or State, or receiving any Approbation from them. So that it's no Fault of yours, if all Mankind don't, according to your Laudable Example, shake off all Subjection to them, and re-assume their Primitive Liberty.*

But at the same time, Sir, how such Practises can agree with the Laws of God, and the Laws of the Land, to which you ought to conform your self as a Christian, and a Subject, you would do well to inform us. You must not think to satisfie the Curiosity of this Age, by referring us to the disputed Practises of the Patriarchs, which were not founded on any Positive Command, nor yet to some Instances of Concubinage found among Christians in Constantine's *time, or before; nor to the advancement of the Issue of Concubines now and then to the Chief Seats of Civil Government; Nay, nor to God's making use of the Children of Con-*

cubinage sometimes to be Instruments of his Glory. None of these are sufficient to satisfie our Reason, and much less our Conscience, which in matters of this Importance, expects to be assur'd by Revelation.

God allow'd but one Wife to Adam when the World was to be Peopled at first; nor any more but one Wife a peice to Noah and his Sons, when it was to be Peopled a second time. And the reason of this was as we are inform'd by Malachi, Because he would have a Holy Seed, which insinuates strongly, That Concubinage is unholy. Solomon, tho Guiltiest of all Mankind yet durst not venture to teach the Lawfulness of Concubinage according to your Practice; but tho he had been polluted thereby himself, gives precepts full of purity to others, advising Them to rejoyce with the Wife of their Youth, and to let her Breasts satisfy them at all times, *Prov.* 5. 15. Nor is there throughout the whole Scripture more Emphatical and Passionate Exhortations to beware of Strange Women, and more Lively Descriptions of Whoredom, and the danger of it, then is to be found in the Book of the Proverbs. The Pen-man having suffered Shipwrack on those Shelves himself, was therefore the more fit to paint out the danger of them to others, which he has accordingly done; so far was he from recommending his own Practice to others, as you do,

It is also certain that our Saviour and his Apostles have commanded, that every Man should have his own Wife, and every Woman her own

own Husband. *Nor is there the least Vestige of* Concubinage *to be found allowed in* the New Testament. *So that it is exceeding strange that you should stretch your Commission, and wrest Texts to teach us* Concubinage, *especially when the Age has more need of a* Curb *than a* Spur *as to that matter.*

But above all things in your Book, those Blasphemous Reflections upon the Conception and Birth of our blessed Saviour choak me most. Had you no other way to defend your own practice but by such profane Allusions? Don't the Scriptures teach you, That there is no such thing as Marrying and giving in Marriage in the Kingdom of Heaven? *Can there be any Analogy betwixt the blessed Virgins Immaculate and Wonderful Conception, and the Pregnancy of others before Marriage? Is there any similitude betwixt that which is done by the Omnipotence of God, without any possible Concurrence of humane Corruption, and the practice of* Concubinage? *Really, Sir, this Notion appears to me so very foul and horrid, that I think there can be no better Advice given to you than that which the Apostle gave to* Simon Magus, *Acts* 8. 22. Repent therefore of this thy Wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy Heart may be forgiven thee. *Had you taken heed unto your self, and to your Doctrine, according to the Apostle's Advice to* Timothy, *you would never have been guilty of such a Practice, nor have advanced any such Principles.*

In the next place, Sir, let me ask you, What was it you saw in Concubinage, or what mighty Profit have you reap'd thereby your self, that you do with so much Zeal recommend it to others? *Had you but look't into History, either Sacred or Profane, you would have found that the Natural Effects of it were, the breach of the Peace of Families, Quarrels, Murders, and all manner of Uncleanness. It had its rise from* Cains *Family, and you know that he was of* that wicked one; *Murder and Whoredom had both of 'em their Original from the same vile Parent, and Uncleanness and Hatred of true Religion, have always since gone hand in hand, as you may see abundantly proved in the Book call'd,* Gods Judgment against Whoring.

As to your own Family, You own that the Children of your first Marriage are Rebellious and Disobedient, that they have offered Violence to your own Person, and continue to oppress and slander you, that your first Wife hath deserted you, [as you say] *because you disinherited her Eldest Son a Papist, and* [as she says] *because you had got your Maid with child before-hand, and you add that she and her Sons have unjustly possess'd themselves of your Inheritance. These, and such as these, are the Blessed effects of your own Concubinage, and yet you are so good Natur'd as to recommend it to others. Let's suppose now your children by* Mary Tomkins, *come also to years of Maturity, will not they have the same Rancour against* Martha Perkins *and her*

Children,

Children, as she and hers have against them? Will not both Broods be enrag'd to find their respective Mothers treated as an Harlot, and is not this the Natural Result of your Concubinage.

Then as to the Opinion that the World entertains of you, It cannot be suppos'd to be very favourable. The worst of Men, abominate a Leud Clergy-man, and you own your self that you are Accounted such an one, and let me tell you that your Defence will be far from healing your Reputation, there's no way left you for that, but to confess and forsake. You will not find that Men of Sense and Probity will take your Arguments as unanswerable; and tho some of your Brethren you say, have giv'n no reply to what you return'd as an Answer to their Reproof, all others will not therefore think themselves obliged to keep silent. The Cause concerns the welfare of our Souls and Bodys, Posterities and Families too much, to let you pass without a Publick Answer, tho hitherto you have escap'd any Publick Censure more than the Presentment of the Grand Jury; The Author of this Reply, has no Personal Acquaintance with you, nor pick against you, and if in some Places, you find that he hath treated you sharply, it's no more than what he thought the Cause requir'd. It seem'd indeed a sort of a Paradox to him, that a Man should pretend to so much Conscience of keeping an Oath to a Temporal Prince, from which his Abdication and the Causes of it, absolv'd him in the Opinion both of Church and State, and yet make no scruple of breaking his Marriage Vow to

God

God and his Wife, by taking another into her Bed before his Cause was heard and much less determin'd. That he himself should take upon him to be Judge in his own Cause, and yet not allow the Supreme Power *of the Nation to be Judge in theirs against a Prince, whom he owns to* have Acted Tyrannically, by erecting an High Commission Court to supersede the Proceedings of all others, and to Act in favour of Persons Popishly Inclin'd. *That Mr.* Butler *should allow Desertion in his own Wife, to be a sufficient Cause of Divorce, and of Marrying another, and yet scruple to own that Tyranny and Desertion, are not sufficient to dissolve the Contract betwixt King and People, and to justify their setting another upon the Throne; Says, that he is a very partial Casuist, and gives the Reader very much cause to suspect his sincerity.*

In the next place let me ask you, what mighty blessings they are which the Turks *reap from their Poligamy? You cannot pretend that it hath encreased their Off-spring, and made them Populous. For daily experience teaches us, that their Numbers are now very much exhausted; which is the Natural consequence of Poligamy at last, tho it may prove otherwise for an Age or two at first. The reasons of this are obvious. For,*

1. *Too much Venery consumes a Mans Bones and Flesh, and the Issue of such Consumptive and Incontinent Parents, will in time enfeeble the whole Nation.*

2. *A Man making uſe of more Wives than one at a time, occaſions the Women to think that they ought to have the ſame Liberty; How many unhappy Inſtances does our own Nation afford of this, that the Man going aſtray, hath made the Woman take that ſame Courſe, which all Men own to be deſtructive to Propagation, and muſt in time diminiſh the Number of People?*

3. *When a Man hath ſuch a Numerous Family as he cannot ſufficiently provide for; then all of them come to be neglected, and to want the neceſſary conveniencies of Life, which ſhortens their Days, and Breeds Naſty and Contagious Diſtempers amongſt them, as is evident from the frequent* Plagues *amongſt the* Turks, *whereof this is aſſign'd as one* Principal *Cauſe, and its apparent enough amongſt the children of common Beggars, and the Pooreſt Sort, many of whom Periſh by Naſty Diſeaſes, which renders them Loathſome to the Eyes and Noſes of thoſe that walk the Streets.*

And if Poligamy *were allow'd in this Nation according to your Propoſal, we ſhould quickly find that our greateſt Eſtates would be much too ſmall to maintain the numerous Offſpring of Perſons of Quality, according to their Birth; ſo that they muſt quickly be reduced to Miſery, and the Original Families ſuddenly periſh. For the Children of one Wife would think they had as good right to be provided for out of their Father's Eſtates, as thoſe of another; Which if they were, it would ſpeedily diſmember the largeſt*

Patri-

Patrimonies that any of our Nobility enjoy and if they were not, it would occaſion endleſs Quarrels and Murders betwixt Brethren and Siſters. If you had but looked into our antient Hiſtory, and conſider'd what a Miſerable, Bruitiſh, and Defenceleſs People our Anceſtors were, at the time of the Roman *Invaſion, when* Poligamy *was allowed amongſt them, you would quickly find what I ſay to be true.*

You muſt alſo know, that the Imperial Laws condemn Poligamy, *Lib. 9. Tit. 9. Leg. 18.* Eum qui habet duas Uxores comitatur Infamia, i. e. *He is counted infamous that hath two Wives.* Diocleſian *made a Law likewiſe againſt having of two Wives:* Cod. Lib. 5. Tit. 5. Leg. 2 *And the Chriſtian Emperors,* Theodoſius, Arcadius, *and* Honorius, *would not ſuffer the* Jews *that lived in the* Roman *Empire, to have many Wives, as may be ſeen by their Laws,* Cod. de judæi. Leg. *So unjuſtly have you appealed to the Practice of the Antient Chriſtians, either Magiſtrates or Miniſters, as Patrons of* Concubinage. *You know likewiſe that St.* Hierome *condemns* Lamech *as the firſt,* Qui unam coſtam diſtraxit in duas, *who made two Ribs of one.*

Nor can it be unknown to you, that Clergymen committing Adultery, were for ever removed from their Miniſtry, Diſtinct. 81. C. 11, 12. *That the* Ancyran Synod *impoſed Seven Years Pennance upon the Adulterer; and that the Council of* Neocæſarea *Decreed,*

creed, that if a Minister's Wife fell into Adultery, he should dismiss her, or else leave his Ministry, and by the Eliberine Council he was denied for ever the Communion of the Church, if he did not dismiss her, and that it was likewise Decreed, that the Adulterer should not be suffer'd to Marry with the Adultress; yet you own that you had just Cause to suspect your Wife, and can prove several suspicious Tokens of her Unfaithfulness, p. 18. and yet never offer'd to put her away: And she accuses you of committing Adultery with her Maid before she left you, and yet you took your Maid into her Bed, without any Application either to Church or State, notwithstanding the depending Controversies betwixt you and your Wife. These are suspicious Tokens of an Inordinate Love; for which, had you but made use of the first and second Remedies prescribed by the Heathens, viz. Λιμὸς and Χρόνος Abstinence and Time, you had been in no danger of the third Remedy βρόχος an Halter, though it had been better you should have had a Mill-stone hang'd about your Neck, and been thrown into the middle of the Sea, than to have given such Offence as you have done to the Church of God.

Nor can you be ignorant neither, that many satisfying Answers have been given to your Arguments, from the Polygamy of the Patriarchs and Jews: As 1. That if there had been any Relaxation of the Law of Monogamy, instituted by God

God in Paradice, it would have been by a written Law and Expres's Scripture. 2. That if this had been allowed for Procreation, it had been most Necessary to be granted unto Adam in the beginning of the World, and to Noah in reviving and re-peopling the World. And 3. That Polygamy, or marrying of many Wives, rendered Solomon unfit for Procreation, as is evident by his small Posterity. And, 4. That the Law of Monogamy being revived by Christ and his Apostles, and brought back to the first Institution, was to take place, not for the Time past, but for the Time to come, as all other positive Laws of Nations do: So that though Polygamy might be then tolerated as an Infirmity, for a time, in those which were newly converted; yet it cannot be so now.

I shall add that if the first institution of Marriage, between one Man and one Woman at a time be once broken, there's no other Limitation to be found in the Scriptures; whence it follows, that if more be allowed then one, a Man may have as many as he pleases, So that it will be hard to bring it to a Medium. Some perhaps will plead for King Charles II's. Number as a Standard, and others it may be, will be satisfied with no fewer than Solomon, and so our Nobility and Gentry (if your Project take place) should have Kennels of Concubines, as now they have of Hounds. And what Inconveniences this might occasion, you may know by your own Incontinence, those Poor Women must loose their Youth, and Teeming time, with-

without any hopes of having Nature satisfied; For being another Mans Property, no body else must meddle with them, and so they must either burn and languish, or commit Whoredom, nay, perhaps bestiality. Their own Stallion (for Husband he is not) must speedily be either enfeebled, or neglect some or all of them, as we find in Ahasuerus, *who did not call for his Beautiful and Beloved* Esther *in Thirty Days together. And the rest of his Concubines were never brought to him except he delighted in any of them, and call'd her by Name, yet they were shut up and kept close by the Keeper of the Women. So that here was a Great Number of Females rendred useless for Propagation, besides the Tentations they were exposed to, of being base with* Eunuchs *and their own nearest Relations.*

Now, Sir, pray consider whether these and the other Reasons that you will meet with in this Book, be not much more solid against Concubinage, *than any that you have advanc'd for it. And if your Conscience be convinced, be not ashamed to Retract what you have so unadvisedly writ upon this Head. St.* Augustine, *who was much a Learneder Divine, and better Man than you can pretend to be, did not think it unbecoming him to Recant his Errors, and to take shame to himself for his Youthful Lusts; but Yours can scarcely pass under that denomination, who went into your Maids Bed, after having Lived Forty Years with a* Wife.

Your

Your Loose Book hath done a World of Mischief in the Nation; and therefore it concerns you, as you would have the pardon of God, and his Church for the same, to make your Confession and Recantation as publick as your Crime; *Which that you may do, is the worst that the Author of this Book wishes you.*

Concubinage

Concubinage

Disproved, &c.

HAD a Pamphlet of this Nature been writ by an avowed Debauchee, or a Play-house Beau, it had been no matter of Surprize: But to have any thing Printed in Defence of *Concubinage* by a Batchelor of Divinity, and a Minister of the Church of *England*, may Justly astonish us. Such a thing might be accounted Natural, in a Priest of the Church of *Rome*, the Mother of Harlots, and of the Abominations of the Earth; but for a Minister of the Reformed Church to do so gross a thing, is altogether unsufferable.

Time was when the Reverend Mr. *Johnson* was degraded by those that called themselves the Church of *England*, because he maintained the Doctrine of Self-defence against Tyrants, or others; which is the Instinct of pure Nature: There's much more reason for

the Governours of the Church to shew themselves as zealous now in censuring Mr. *Butler* for writing in defence of *Concubinage*; which is one of the Effects of depraved Nature: And this I think they are the more concern'd to do, because in his Title-Page he endeavours to make way for his Doctrine by the Authority of his Character.

It is certain this Author can find nothing either in the Articles, Homilies, or Canons of the Church of *England*, to defend his Principles or Practice; So that he cannot plead any Authority from her, whatever he may do from his being in Orders. Nor is that Venerable Society any thing oblig'd to him for the Character which he assumes to himself of being a Minister of the *True Church of England*; The Natural Consequence of which Expression is, That somewhere or other there is a False one. By some Hints in his Pamphlet, as, *That he has been accused of being an Enemy to the Government*; and *that he is such an one as hath kept his Oaths to his hurt*, &c. I presume he may be a *Non-Juror*; and if that be the Case, we know what he means by his True Church; and to say the Truth of them, *such Parson, such People*, was never more fitly applied. It has been observed all along since the Revolution, that most of the Whores are in King *James*'s Interest, nor will it be any great Loss to King *William*, if this *Advocate of Whoring* be thrown into the Scale.

It's

It's none of my buſineſs to enter upon the Merits of the Cauſe betwixt him and his *Quondam* Wife. It's probable enough, nay, certainly true, if we may believe his own word, that he and ſhe both are guilty of ſuch Iniquity as ought to be puniſh'd by the Judges; and in recommending his Book to the Care and Enquiry of the Bench, I Joyn cordially with *the Grand Jury of London*, who in this, and other Preſentments, have behaved themſelves as became good Men and Chriſtians.

Before I come to touch upon his Arguments *in Defence of Concubinage*, I find it neceſſary to make ſome previous Remarks.

The firſt is, That our Author is not to be taken as an Indifferent Perſon or Judge in this Caſe, becauſe it is his own Practice he defends; and the Depravation of Mankind is now ſo very great, that we ſhall have the moſt horrid Crimes, as Murder, Aſſaſſination, and what not, defended by the Criminals who commit them.

The next is, That our Author, according to what is ſaid of other Evil Men and Seducers, waxes worſe and worſe; for in the beginning of his Book he ſeems only to vindicate his own particular Caſe, as having a deſerting Wife, and being under an Impoſſibility of having Juſtice done him; and therefore he thought it lawful for him *to go in to his Maid*; But in the latter end of his Pamphlet he ſets up for a General Concubinage, ev'n

during the Life and Co-habitation of Lawful Wives.

These things being laid down as necessary to give the Reader a precaution as to what sort of an Author we have to deal with, I come now to consider his Arguments.

The First he offers is page 9. Viz. *That he was guilty of no other, nor greater Fornication with his Maid, than* Abraham, *the Father of the Faithful, was guilty of, when purely for Issues sake, and not of any Lustful Concupiscence, he went in to* Hagar, *his Wifes Maid, or in to* Keturah, *his Concubine, in the Life-time of* Sarah, *his Wife. Now* Abraham *was not charged with any thing of Fornication in that Case, but rather was acquitted by God Almighty, as purely and truly Innocent; but the Case of this Respondent is much easier than that of* Abraham; *forasmuch as at the time aforesaid* Abraham *had a Wife then in his Bed with him, but this Respondent had no Wife.*

ANSWER.

1. Our Author owns that *Abraham* did not go in to *Hagar* out of any Lustful Concupiscence, but purely for Issues sake; but page 9. he says of himself, *That he is one of those of whom our Saviour hath declared,* All men cannot receive this saying, *Matth.* 19.10. *and of whom St.* Paul *hath declared,* 1 Cor. 8.9. It is better to marry than to burn; *and that he was not Na-*

tu-

turally endowed with the Gift of Continency from Heaven. Whence it follows, That our Author by his own confession, went in to his Maid out of a Principle of Incontinence, and burning Lust.

2. This appears yet more plain: Whereas he owns, *that* Abraham *went in to* Hagar *purely for Issues sake*, he having none at that time; which was not our Author's Case; for he confesses, page 4. that he had Lawful Issue living by his Wife; which demonstrates, Mr. *Butler* himself being Judge, that his Case and *Abraham*'s were not the same.

3. *Abraham* took *Hagar* to Wife by *Sarah*'s Consent; and tho not with the usual Solemnity of Marriage, yet 'twas undoubtedly in a Publick manner; but Mr. *Butler* owns, page 18. that his Wife was so far from consenting to his taking of his Maid *Mary Tomkins*, that she gives it out as one cause of her deserting him.

4. It does not appear by any thing our Author says, that his Marriage with *Mary Tomkins* was any other than *Congressus Furtivus*, a *Westminster* Wedding: or *Nuptiæ Caninæ*, as St. *Jerome* calls it somewhere.

5. Mr. *Butler*'s Instance of *Abraham*'s going in to *Keturah*, during *Sarahs* Life, is false; for it appears that *Sarah* was then dead, *Gen.* 25. 1. and *Hagar* and her Son *Ishmael* were sent away before that by God's own appointment, *Gen.* 21. So that this Instance makes nothing at all for his purpose. But it looks very ill in a Di-

vine, as Mr. *Butler* pretends to be, thus to miſ-quote Scripture: It argues that he is glad of any covering, tho it were but of Fig-leaves to cover his Nakedneſs.

6. Mr. *Butler* cannot but know that *P.* Martyr, and other Commentators upon the Place, are of Opinion, that the Occaſion of *Sarah*'s giving this Advice, and of *Abraham*'s accepting of it, was her own Barrenneſs, the advanced Age of 'em both, and fear that they ſhould no otherwiſe have the Promiſed Seed, to which I hope our Author will not pretend there is any thing parallel in his Caſe.

7. Whereas he ſays *that Abraham was not charged with any thing of Fornication in that Caſe, but rather was acquitted by God Almighty as truely and purely Innocent.* It were to be wiſh'd he would produce ſome Scripture for his Aſſertion; In my Opinion the Diſpleaſure of God againſt this Practice of the *Patriarch* appears very plain, as has been obſerv'd by the Author of that uſeful Book, newly publiſhed, entituled, *God's Judgments againſt Whoring; being an Eſſay towards a general Hiſtory of it for above Five Thouſand Years,* Viz. *That the Peace of* Abraham's *Family was immediately broke, by* Hagar's *deſpiſing her Miſtreſs, as ſoon as ſhe found her ſelf pregnant with the Promiſed Seed, as ſhe vainly believ'd. Upon which* Sarah *upbraids* Abraham, *with the Wrong, whereof ſhe her ſelf was the occaſion;* Hagar *was alſo puniſhed for her unlawful Conſent;*

ſent; firſt, by being ſeverely dealt with by Sarah, *and then by being thruſt out of the Family, and expos'd to the World, and the cruel Neceſſity of ſeeing her Son die of Thirſt as ſhe apprehended; and inſtead of his being the Promiſed Seed, ſhe and he were both Ignominouſly thruſt out from being Partakers of the Inheritance with* Iſaac.

8. *Polygamy* was at that time common in the World, ſo that *Abraham*'s Practice adminiſtred no occaſion of Scandal, whereas our Author well knew that his *Concubinage* with *Mary Tomkins* would unavoidably give Offence, upon which Conſideration alone, he ought to have forborn it, if he had deſign'd to walk according to the Apoſtolical Rule, who had rather never eat Fleſh while he liv'd, tho a thing lawful in it ſelf, than offend a weak Brother.

9. His Argument to prove the Lawfulneſs of *Abraham*'s Practice, becauſe God did not charge him with any thing of Fornication, is altogether inconcludent; for in the firſt place it is not a ſufficient Ground for us poſitively to ſay that God did not reprove him for it, becauſe there's nothing of any ſuch Reproof mentioned in the Scripture. *Moſes*, the inſpired Penman, is here giving us an Hiſtorical Account of Matter of Fact, and does not enter upon the Debate of the Lawfulneſs or Unlawfulneſs of the thing. In the next place Mr. *Butler* may as well argue from the Practice of *Jacob*, which we find

no where reproved by God that it is lawful for a Man to marry two Sisters at one time, whereas all Divines allow, that this is forbidden, both by the Light of Nature and Revelation.

10. To answer once for all, Mr. *Butler*'s Arguments from the *Old-Testament* for *Poligamy* or *Concubinage*. He cannot but know,

1. That Marriage was instituted at first by God, betwixt one Man and one Woman; so that to plead for a Necessity of more Husbands or Wives than one at a time, is in effect to arraign the Wisdom of the first Institutor, the All-wise God.

2. That when the old World was destroyed, and chiefly for Uncleanness amongst other Sins as appears by *Gen.* 6. 2. God appointed *Noah* and his three Sons, to take only one Wife each into the Ark with them, so that here God commanded the peopling of the World a second time by Marriage betwixt one Man and one Woman, without allowing *Polygamy* or *Concubinage*.

3. That the Text, *Leviticus* 18. 18. *Neither shalt thou take a Wife to her Sister to vex her, to uncover her Nakedness, besides the other in her Life time.* The best Divines do generally understand it to be meant of having two Wives together, first, because the Phrase is so used elsewhere, as *Ezek.* 1. 9. the Wings of the Beasts are said to touch a Woman to her Sister that is meet together, or touch one another; and so *Exod.* 26. 3.

the

the five Curtains shall be coupled, the Woman to her Sister, that is, together. In the next place, because the Marriage of the Sister is by Analogy forbidden before *v.* 16. *Thou shalt not uncover the Nakedness of thy Brothers Wife, it is thy Brothers Nakedness.* Whence by Parity of Reason it was equally unlawful to uncover the Sisters Nakedness; so that this being provided for before, there was no need of repeating it here; thirdly, the Reason subjoyn'd, *viz.* to vex her, maketh against the Joint Marriage of any other, as well as of the Sister; for the common Experience of all Ages teaches, that there was always Jealousie and Contention betwixt *Co-wives*, as in the Instance of *Sarah* and *Hagar*, just now mentioned; and *Annah* and *Penninah*, the Wives of *Elkanah*, 1 *Sam.* 1. tho they were not Sisters: And Mr. *Butler* can prove it from his own Experience, that *Martha Perkins* and *Mary Tomkins*, his two Wives, do vex one another, tho they be not Sisters.

4. As to his Instances of *David* and *Solomon*, and other Kings, who abounded in Wives and Concubines, they acted therein expresly contrary to the Law in that case, *Deut.* 17. 16. where it is said of the King, *Neither shall he multiply Wives to himself.* The Holy Ghost foreseeing that they who abound in Riches and Power, and especially Princes are more apt to exceed that way than others.

5. Mr. *Butler* has no doubt read, that *Lorinus* and others are of Opinion, That the *Polygamy* of the Fathers was diſpens'd with *per inſpirationem internam* by a ſecret Diſpenſation, which cannot, if it were true, juſtifie *Concubinage* under the *New-Teſtament*, from which nothing can be pleaded by any ſuch Diſpenſation.

6. He muſt needs alſo know that it is the common Opinion of Proteſtant Divines, that it was not probable that God would diſpenſe with a Publick Law by a Private Diſpenſation, and therefore, tho he wink'd at thoſe times of Ignorance, he gave no Allowance to any ſuch Practice, as is plain from *Malachi* 2. 14. 15, 16. Where the Prophet tells the Children of *Iſrael*, *That the Lord regarded not their Offering, becauſe he had been Witneſs between thee and the Wife of thy youth, againſt whom thou haſt dealt treacherouſly, yet is ſhe thy Companion, and the Wife of thy Covenant*: And *v.* 15. he expoſtulates with them from the firſt Inſtitution of Marriage thus: *And did he make one? yet had he the reſidue of the Spirit, and wherefore one? becauſe he ſought a Godly Seed; therefore take heed to your Spirit, and let none deal treacherouſly againſt the Wife of his Youth*;— and verſe 16. he adds, *For the Lord God of Iſrael ſaith that he hateth putting away.* This Prophet liv'd as ſome think in the time of *Artaxerxes*, or *Darius Longimanus*; but however that is, this is plain, that as in the beginning of the Old-Teſtament, we have

have an Account that God at firſt inſtituted Marriage betwixt one Man and one Woman; ſo by this Prophet, who ſhuts up the Canon of the Old Teſtament, he expoſtulates with his People, for receding from the Primary Inſtitution, which enervates all the Arguments that Mr. *Butler* hath brought from thence, in Defence of *Concubinage:*

But this is not the only Caſe, wherein our Author ſhews himſelf to be a *looſe Caſuiſt*; for Page 9. he tells us, *That Incontinency in it ſelf is no Sin, unleſs it be expreſs'd in unlawful uſes*; whereas the Apoſtle, 2 *Tim.* 3. 3. reckons *Incontinent* Men amongſt Truce-breakers, Falſe Accuſers, Deſpiſers of thoſe that are Good, and ſuch others as contribute to make up the Perillous Times, that are to come in the laſt days. Mr. *Pool*, in his Criticks on 1 *Cor.* 7. 5. quotes *Tremellius*, *Piſcator*, *Hammond*, and *Zegerus*, as tranſlating the word, rendred Incontinence (by our Tranſlators) *Concupiſcence of the Fleſh*, and others of 'em render it *Intemperance*, which laſt Word is never taken but in an ill Senſe. *Tremellius* from the *Syriak* tranſlates it *Impotentia*, which ſignifies an unruly raging Luſt; which is certainly ſinful; and ſuch Mr. *Butler*'s Incontinence appears to have been, when he could not be without a Woman above a Year; one would have thought that a Divine, who enjoyns Faſting and Prayer to others, ſhou'd rather have tried that Experiment upon himſelf, than have run the hazard

of

of such Inconveniences, as the Titillation of the Flesh, has already brought upon him. The Apostle tells us, *They that are Christ's, crucifie the Flesh with its Lusts and Affections*, Gal. 5. 24. and in 1 Cor. 9. 17. that he *kept his Body under, and brought it into Subjection, lest when he preach'd to others, he himself should be a Cast-away*; but it seems Mr. *Butler* chose rather to *make provision for the Flesh to fulfil the Lusts thereof*. If he could not have his Wife he would have his Maid; and is not satisfied *to break the Commandments himself, but teaches others also to do so*; and therefore deserves *to be called the Least in the Kingdom of Heaven*, according to our Saviour's threatning, *Matth.* 5. 19. and I doubt not but he knows what is meant thereby; *viz.* That he shall be accounted unworthy to be reckoned among the Saints here or hereafter, if he don't break off from his sins by Repentance. Our Saviour, *Matth.* 5. 28. tells us, That they who *Look on a Woman so as to Lust after her, are guilty of Adultery*. And the Apostle *Peter* tells us of those that *have Eyes full of Adultery*, 2 Pet. 2. 14. Which demonstrate clearly enough, that Incontinency, the Fountain whence Lustful Looks proceed, is sinful in it self. Indeed the Natural Appetite of Generation, and multiplying our Species according to the Command of God, is not sinful in it self, so long as it is contain'd within due bounds; but when once it breaks over that, then it becomes Incontinence, and by consequence sinful. The Original Word,

A-

Ἀκρατεῖς, translated *Incontinent*, denotes such, *qui nec in bono nec in malo sibi constant*, they can keep no bounds, but will either be over-much Righteous or over-much Wicked: So that it's plain, Incontinence, which Mr. *Butler* will have to be no sin, implies the Height of Passion.

But it seems he thought himself concern'd, in point of Reputation, to maintain, that Incontinence was no sin, because he owns himself to be guilty of it, page 9. Yet if he had but adverted to the saying of the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 7. 9. which he quotes in the same place, *viz.*, *They who cannot contain, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn*; he might easily have perceiv'd that *Incontinence* and *burning* are Synonymous Terms; for there *burning* is oppos'd to *Continency*; the Holy Ghost telling us plainly, that they who cannot contain must burn, if they do not marry, and therefore provides Marriage as a proper Remedy against Incontinency; which if it were not a Distemper, why should there be any Remedy provided against it.

Here also I think fit to take notice of our Author's distorted Notion of Fornication, whereof he says, page 8. *A man may be guilty by Excess of Carnal Usage with his own Wife.* That this Notion of Fornication is very gross and absurd, will appear from this one thing, that if a Man may be guilty of Fornication with his own Wife, then he may divorce her when he pleases for his own Crime; for our Saviour al-

allows a man to put away his Wife in case of Fornication, without any Exception, whether it be with her Husband, or any other man, *Matth.* 5. 32. So that instead of a man's being guilty of Fornication with his own Wife, our Author should have said, of Excess in the use of the Marriage-bed; for tho Fornication is sometimes us'd in Scripture to denote Uncleanness in general: yet according to the common acceptation of the word, it denotes Uncleanness betwixt persons, that are not married to one another, as was usually practised in those *Fornices*, or Vaults under ground, at *Rome* and elsewhere; whence the word *Fornication* was deriv'd. Of those Vaults *Socrates*, *Lib.* 5. *cap.* 18. gives us a particular account; *viz.* That they were Victualling-houses under ground, wherein the *Romans* prostituted Whores, until the Emperor *Theodosius* order'd them to be pulled down.

I come next to Mr. *Butler*'s Case, as represented by himself, page 9, *&c.* Viz. *That his Wife denied him the use of her Marriage bed obstinately* (tho *she was often intreated to the contrary*) *for above a Twelvemonth*; *and therefore he went in to his Maid.* The Necessity he pretends he lay under was this, *In the first place, he had not the Gift of Continency*; *then it was not convenient for him to marry another without a Lawful License from a Lawful Authority, because of a Statute-Law in force*: *That in the time of this desertion, Popery had the Supream Seat:*

Seat: That there were high Commissioners superceeding all other Courts in Power, and Acting in favour of Persons Popishly inclin'd, and that his Wife having deserted him, because of his disinheriting his Eldest Son for turning Papist; No sentence could be expected from them, according to the Justice of Holy writ, because Papists hold Marriage indissolvable, as being one of their seven Sacraments without a dispensation from the Pope. Thus Mr. *Butler* States his own Case.

In the next place, I shall give you his Wifes State of the Case, as represented in her Libel before the Honourable Court of Arches, and quoted by himself, p. 6. Viz. *That about Ten Years since,* John Butler *being unmindful of his Conjugal Vow committed, the foul Crime of Adultery, with his Servant Maid* Mary Tomkins; *and it being taken Notice of, that she was with Child by him, he and she went into* Holland, *where they liv'd Incontinently for about two Years, and there she brought forth a Bastard call'd* Mary *to the said* John Butler, *and* p. 35. *That they return'd to* England, *and Live together in an Incontinent manner at* Hammersmith, *and the said* Mary *hath had four other base born Children, begotten by the said* John Butler, *who hath Lately turn'd his Wife* Mary Butler *out of Doors, and left her destitute of necessaries,* &c.

Now any Man may see that there is a vast difference in the Cases, as they are Stated by Mr. *Butler* and his Wife.

It

It is also proper to observe here, that his Incontinence with *Mary Tomkins* is not the only Uncleanness which our Author stands charg'd with; for page 8. he owns, *That his said Wife, and his two ungracious Sons, have fill'd the Country with many slanders and suspicious Reports, of matters said or done by him, above Twenty or Thirty Years since;* and Answers thus, *Concerning what kindnesses this Respondent might have shewed to particular Persons more then Ordinary, he doth solemnly protest, that he never had Carnal Knowledge of any such Woman, for whose sake he was aspers'd.*

Having thus laid down their mutual Accusations against one another, I shall first make some Remarks upon 'em, and then proceed to consider Mr. *Butlers* defence.

It's plain, that Mr. *Butler* owns himself to be Incontinent, and I think it will appear that he was so, to a scandalous excess from the Matter of Fact, as laid down by himself. For 1. He says, that he was deserted by a Wife, whom p. 3. he owns, *That he did heartily Love*, which one would think should have been sufficient of it self, to have restrain'd his Concupiscence for above one year at least, seeing most modest Men do in ordinary Cases, think themselves obliged in Decency to stay so long unmarried after the Death of a Wife whom they Loved. Much more should an honest Man abstain for the sake of a beloved Wife still alive.

2. He owns that he had two ungracious Sons, the Eldeſt of whom he diſinherited becauſe of his turning Papiſt; this methinks to a Miniſter of the Goſpel, ſhould have been a Cauſe of Faſting and Prayer, and Mortifying of the Fleſh. To be abandoned by a Loving Wife, afflicted by two ungracious Sons at the ſame time, and one of them turn'd Idolater, and running headlong to Damnation too: Any thing of a Chriſtian would have ſeen the Hand of God, in all this, humbled themſelves before him, afflicted their Souls by ſecret Faſting and Prayer, and have deſir'd the Prayers of the Church, and their particular Chriſtian Friends, in ſuch a pungent Affliction.

If in ſuch a Caſe the Devil had begun to tempt Mr. *Butler*, for his Incontinency, Why did he not bring his Body under Subjection by Faſting, Watching and Prayer, according to the Practice of the Apoſtle; who thereby got rid of that Thorn in the Fleſh mentioned, 2 *Cor.* 12. 7. Which Mr. *Butler* knows many Commentators, and thoſe, none of the leaſt, Note, underſtand to have been *Pruritus Carnis*, the Tickling of the Fleſh, as *Tremellius* renders it from the *Syriack*. But it ſeems, our Author was in this Reſpect like the Phariſees of Old, who would bind heavy burdens upon other Mens backs but would not touch them themſelves with one of their Fingers. Mr. *Butler* could not but forſee that this Practice of going in to his Maid, which is

unpresidented in this Nation, would administer cause of Scandal; and this it became one of his Character to avoid above all Men; If his Maids Beauty tempted him, it was in his Power to have rid himself of that Tentation: But to be plain with him, his Case has all the suspicious Circumstances Imaginable, to make the World believe that he was Acted by down-Right Lust in this matter, and being once engaged, now he would defend it, Answerable to the Practise of that *Infamous German Enthusiast*, John *of* Leyden, *who being observed to go into his Maids bed, did thereupon maintain the Doctrine of Poligamy; and the like unclean Practice engaged the false Prophet* Mahomet, *in the Defence of the like unclean Doctrine.*

3. Mr. Butler owns, *That his Wife and Sons accuse him of former Incontinency*; and the Truth on't is, his Practice and Principles, both being considered, there's no great Reason to doubt, but their Accusation might be true. If he owns his Incontinency now when Aged, It's probable he was more so Twenty Years ago: If the desertion of a beloved Wife, the Rebellion and Apostacy of his Sons, the Common danger which all Men at that time thought impending over the Church, whereof he was a Minister, the Dignity of his Function, and the Scandal of the World could not keep him from his Maids Bed Ten Years ago, What can be thought sufficient to

have

have restrain'd him from such like Practises Twenty Years ago?

4. If there was no such unlawful Dalliance betwixt Mr. *Butler* and his Maid, while his Wife Cohabited with him, It's much that his Maid was so soon brought over to receive another Womans Husband into her Bed, and indeed one would think that Mr. *Butler* at that time, should have had so much trouble upon him on the Account of his Wife and Children, *&c.* As above, that he should have had little Inclination or leasure for a New Courtship, if the Familiarity had *not been Contracted before.* So much for the Causes to suspect, that Mr. *Butler* was guilty of Scandalous Incontinence in this matter.

I come now to consider the pretended Necessity he says he lay under. *Durum telum Necessitas*, Necessity is indeed an Irresistible Weapon, but many times we make a Necessity to our selves when God makes none, and such, I am affraid Mr. *Butlers* Necessity will be found.

His Necessity proceeded meerly from his Incontinence as he owns himself, but we hear nothing either of Spiritual or Temporal means us'd by him to remove this Incontinence; Had he fasted, watched, prayed, removed his Maid out of his sight, taken the advice of Physicians, open'd a Vein frequently, Bath'd in cold Water often, and been assiduous in the Work of his Calling as a Minister, and yet found his Incontinence too

hard for him after all, there would have been ſome juſtifiable Pretence for his Neceſſity, but we find nothing of this done, and therefore the Neceſſity is of his own making.

If Mr. *Butler* had found his *Pruritus Carnis* or Incontinence unconquerable, after the uſe of theſe, or ſuch like Means as above-mentioned, had it not been better for him to have reconciled his Wife to him, by reſtoring his Popiſh Son to the Right of Inheritance, which he pretends to be the cauſe of her deſerting him, then to take his Maid into his Bed; The former he knows, no Body would have blam'd as Criminal, whereas he could not but know, that the latter would be accounted Scandalous.

Or if this had not been Practicable, why did not he ſue for a Divorce from his Wife upon thoſe juſt ſuſpicions of Incontinence, he charges her with by turns, *p.* 4. of his Epiſtle to the Reader? *&c.* And likewiſe upon the Account of her Deſertion which he ſo much inſiſts upon? Had he done this in a Legal manner, and found all the Doors of ordinary Juſtice ſhut againſt him, then he might have had recourſe to extraordinary Methods; But we don't find that he did any thing like it, ſo that his excuſe of *Poperies being poſſeſs'd of the Supreme Seat, and that the High Commiſſioners ſuperſeded all other Courts, and Acted in favour of Perſons Popiſhly enclin'd, is a meer* Subterfuge, *to cheat his own Con-*

ſcience, and gull the World. This I am ſure he will find a Dilemma, that had he endeavour'd to reconcile his Wife, by reſtoring his Popiſh Son to his Right of Inheritance, he would have herein been favour'd by the Court, as he owns himſelf, and that he was willing to have retain'd his Wife, if ſhe had been willing to have ſtaid with him; he has declar'd it, when he ſays that he ſollicited her to his Bed for above a Twelvemonth. But we don't ſo much as find that he made any Application to the Ordinary Courts in that Caſe, ſo that he Arraigns their Juſtice without having made Tryal of it. It's well enough known to the World that the then Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and ſeveral other Biſhops, did then oppoſe the Proceedings of the Court in Eccleſiaſtical Matters, ſuch as the publiſhing of the Proclamation for Liberty of Conſcience to Diſſenters, and turning out the Fellows of Colledges: So that Mr. *Butler* had no Reaſon to decline Application to the Court of Arches for Remedy in his Caſe; nor is there any Reaſon to think but the High-Commiſſion Court, wherein there were three Biſhops of the Church of *England*, might have done him Juſtice, if he had applied to them in a Caſe ſo plain, as he alledges his to have been.

But ſuppoſing that both thoſe Courts had been over-ruled by the Influence of Father *Peters*, and others, who then govern'd at

Whitehall, what hinder'd Mr. *Butler* from taking ſome of his Brethren of the Clergy, or other Credible Witneſſes with him, Finally, to exhort his Wife, and to declare to her, that if ſhe did not return to her Duty, he would look upon their Marriage as Diſſolv'd, and provide for himſelf accordingly. If ſhe had, after all this, continued Obſtinate, why might not Mr. *Butler* have taken his Maid with him, and before his Brethren of the Miniſtry, or ſome Juſtices of the Peace, declar'd, that his Wife had deſerted him, without any Lawful Cauſe, and would not return to her Duty; that he had applied to all the Ordinary Courts of Juſtice, but could have no Remedy; and therefore being under a Neceſſity, either of burning, or taking another Woman into his Bed, he was reſolv'd to live with his Maid, as Man and Wife? Had Mr. *Butler* done ſo, and made it appear to the World, that his Wife had no juſt Cauſe to deſert him, there are few Caſuiſts ſo Rigid, as to have condemn'd him, either as a Concubinary or Adulterer; every Body would have excus'd the want of due Formalities in ſuch a Caſe, and his Practice would have given no juſt Scandal to others, no more than did that of the Marquis of *Vicum*, which we ſhall have occaſion to touch upon by and by. Mr. *Butler* owns that his Marriage with his Wife was not altogether formal, and yet he made no Scruple to take her to his Bed; and therefore we have no Reaſon to think that

that he ſhould have ſcrupled the doing of this as aboveſaid, had all things been fair and honeſt; and if he had dreaded the anger of the Government, he might have retir'd to *Holland* as he did afterward. But inſtead of this, if we may believe his Wife, as quoted by himſelf, *p.* 18. ſhe accuſes him of ſaying, *That he had another Woman with Child, for which ſhe relinquiſh'd him, and offers to prove his having ſaid ſo.*

Theſe Circumſtances are ſo ſcandalous, that it plainly appears the Matter ought to have been Examined by Judges Competent: but it would ſeem Mr. *Butler*, and his Maid were in too much haſte for that, or indeed to ſtay in the Kingdom, ſeeing they went over to *Holland*, where ſhe brought him forth a Daughter, as he owns himſelf.

I come next to conſider Mr. *Butler*'s Arguments for Defence of his Practice: 1. He quotes 1 *Cor.* 7. 15. where the Apoſtle ſays, *But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart: A brother or a ſiſter is not in bondage in ſuch Caſes. In this Caſe therefore, ſays Mr.* Butler, *a man's own Conſcience was a good Judge, at leaſt until contrary matters could be proved before a Competent Judge, and the Teſtimony of Holy Writ was a ſufficient Law for Conſcience to be guided by, and this without the aſſiſtance of being backt by Authority in a Caſe where an Authoritative ſentence could not be had, as it was in St.* Pauls *time: Wherein the Magiſtracy being altogether Paganiſh, no ſuch ſentence was*

required as needful; and as in the *Marquess of* Vicums *Case, wherein the supreme Authority being Popish, he married again without such a sentence.* 'Tis true indeed, *he had a Sentence by Authority from the Syndick of* Geneva, *but that was as much as just nothing, for first, that Syndick had no Authority to summon his Wife to appear at their Court, she being not under their Jurisdiction, and secondly, being a lay Power set up of their own accord without Power from God, or his Word, had not so much Power as the Conscience of the* Marquess *himself.*

To this I Answer. 1. That Mr. *Butlers* Case and that put by the Apostle are not alike; the Apostle speaks of an Unbelievers deserting a Believer out of an hatred to Religion; but Mr. *Butlers* Wife was of the same Religion with himself, so that he ought to have been backt with the Authority of the Church, whereof they were both Members before he had gone into his Maids Bed. This is the Opinion of *Calvin* and *Sclaterus* upon the place who say, *Lex Christi de Christianæ disciplinæ Consortibus agit, quos propius Vinculum connectit, & apud quos si quod aberratum est, facilis est sanatio per Ecclesiæ Authoritatem*, i. e. The Law of Christ speaks of those who are partakers of the Christian Discipline, and own'd by a nearer Tie, and who if they commit any Error, the cure is easy by the Authority of the Church; but we don't find that Mr. *Butler* sought any such Remedy, but supinely neglected it under a pretence it could

not

not be had. (2.) Mr. *Butlers* Case differs also in this, That we had Christian Magistrates, to whom he might have appeal'd in this Case, which it does not appear he did. Nor will it follow, that because the Apostle says the Believer was at Liberty in Case of the unbelievers deserting, that therefore they were at liberty to take another into their Bed, without acquainting both the Church and the Magistrate with it; It was a General Rule to all Christians, to give no Offence neither to *Jew* nor *Gentile*, nor to the Church of God, and therefore it is not supposeable, that Christians were referred to the dictates of their own Private Conscience in the Case of Marriage after desertion, tho they might rest secure, and without any further trouble upon the Testimony of a good Conscience, as to the cause of desertion, *viz.* That it was from an hatred to their Religion, but Mr. *Butler* knows that his Wife accuses him of another Cause, *Viz.* The defiling of her Bed.

Then as to the *Marquis* of *Vicums* Case, it is also quite different; every one that knows the Story of the Famous *Galeacius Caracciolus*, knows that he fled out of *Italy* upon the Account of his Religion; that his Lady would neither follow him, nor admit him to her Bed, when by the Intercession of his Great Friends he procur'd leave to return for a time, her Priests having prevail'd with her to the contrary, so that he was forced to return without her, and lived several Years unmarried

ried and unblameable at *Geneva*, without getting into any Womans Bed in little more than a Years time, and at last by the consent, not only of the Church of *Geneva*, but of other Protestant Churches, and the approbation of the Supreme Government where he lived, he married a Godly Woman not in a private manner, but in the View of the World; for it's only the deeds of darkness that are afraid of the Light. As to Mr. *Butlers* falling foul upon the Government of *Geneva*, as having no Power from God and his Word, he only discovers that he is as bad a Politician as a Divine, and a Casuist of no Value. That little Common-wealth had always, since any thing was known of the History of those Parts, a Supreme Government of her own, sometimes by a Count, and sometimes under the Protection of the Emperor, and when the Empire was Distracted by Intestine Wars, she had Recourse to her own Bishops who were at that time Powerful, and their Bishops being embroil'd afterwards with the Counts of *Savoy*, she was forc'd to struggle with the succeeding Dukes of *Savoy* for her liberty, and by Allying her self with some of the *Swiss Cantons*, brought the said Dukes to Renounce their Pretensions and at last by the Reformation got Rid of the Yoke of her Bishops who oppos'd it; since which time the Soveraign Authority remains in her Magistrates and Senate, so that Mr. *Butlers* Reflection upon that Government, as wanting

Power

Power to Authorize the Marriage of the Marquis of *Vicum*, then their Subject, ſavours as much of the exploded Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance, as his getting into his Maid's Bed ſavours of Incontinence; and therefore what the Marquis of *Vicum* did in a Publick Manner, with the Conſent of all the Proteſtant Churches in thoſe Parts, and by the Authority of that which was, and is the Supreme Government, where he liv'd, is no Defence for Mr. *Butler*'s Practice without the Knowledge or Conſent of Church or State, or taking the Advice of his Brethren, the Clergy of his Dioceſs. It is alſo to be obſerv'd, that Mr. *Butler* diſcovers a very low Opinion of the Church, whereof he pretends to be a Miniſter, when he thought they would nothave done him Juſtice, or at leaſt declared that he had Juſtice on his ſide, had his Caſe appear'd ſo clear to them, as he alledges it is; but it's rather to be ſuppos'd that he diſtruſted his Cauſe, and therefore durſt not Appeal to them.

I come next to conſider his Quotations from Divines, *&c.* which may ſerve to amuſe one at firſt View, but can never juſtifie him in the Thoughts of a Judicious Reader, they being all of them wreſted, or nothing to his Purpoſe, or elſe directly againſt him.

The firſt he quotes is *Diodati* on 1 *Cor.*7.15. but that Author is againſt him, for he ſpeaks of a convenient time allow'd, and all poſſible and reaſonable Remedies uſed to reduce the Un-

Unbelieving Deserter, before the Marriage can be dissolved; but Mrs. *Butler* was no Unbeliever, nor did Mr. *Butler* use all possible and reasonable Remedies to reduce her; neither is the Case of her Desertion uncontrovertible; she alledges that she has Divorced her self, because of Mr. *Butler*'s Adultery.

The next is *Wollebius*, *Compend. Theolog. Cap.* 11. *Fol.* 245. who only, Says that Adultery and malicious Desertion make a Divorce; but not one word of the Deserted Persons taking another Woman, without proving the Desertion, or asking the Consent of Church and State.

The third is *Amandus Polanus*, *de Divortio*, for which he assigns only two Causes, *Viz.* Adultery, and Unjust Desertion; but Mrs. *Butler* says she had just Cause. The last part of this Quotation is directly against Mr. *Butler*, viz. *Sed si persona accusans honeste vixit & petit ferri sententiam pronuncietur hoc modo cum persona quæ deliquit suo Scelere, dissolverit Conjugium, Judex Authoritate Evangelii personam Innocentem Pronunciat esse Liberam.* i. e. But if the Complainant or Accuser have liv'd honestly, and demands Jugdment, let it be pronounced in this manner; seeing the offending Person hath dissolv'd the Marriage by her own Crime, the Judge, by the Authority of the Gospel, pronounces the Innocent Person to be free, and expresly grants him Liberty, piously to

Contract

Contract another Marriage, according to his own Conſcience. Now it's plain that Mr. *Butler* is accus'd by his Wife of living diſhoneſtly; ſo that this Matter ought to have been clear'd, before the Judge could pronounce any ſuch Sentence.

In the next place it is plain, that *Amandus Polanus* is of Opinion, That ſuch a thing ought to be Judicially done, and in open Court, whereas there was no ſuch Judgment demanded, nor Proceſs made by Mr. *Butler*; ſo that here's his own Evidence turn'd upon him.

His Quotations from *Muſculus* upon the 5th. of *Matthew*, where he aſſigns Adultery and Deſertion, as the Cauſes of Divorce, are nothing to his Purpoſe; he does not ſay that the Matter ought not to be legally determin'd, or that the deſerted Perſon may Marry again without ſuch Determination.

The paſſage of *Ambroſe* on 1 *Cor.* 7. 5. is to the ſame purpoſe, and favours him not one whit.

The like, that of *Bucanus*, *Inſtitut. Theologiæ*. Nor is he any thing more favour'd by that Author, *Locus* 13. Sect. 29. where he ſays in anſwer to the Queſtion, *Quid ſi Magiſtratus officium Negligat.* What if the Magiſtrate neglect his Duty? *Valeat præceptum Apoſtolicum ad Titum* 3. 10. *Hereticum hominem, Ergo & Atheum, Apoſtatum & Blaſphemum, poſt unam & Alteram correctionem*

nem devita:] That is, let the Apoſtles command to *Titus* take place, *Cap.* 3. 10. A Man that is an Heretick, Apoſtate, or Atheiſt, after the firſt and ſecond Admonition, reject or avoid; which Mr. *Butler* wickedly and falſly tranſlates, That if the Magiſtrate neglect his Office, the Innocent Party is free to Marry an Innocent Woman, without his Sentence, whereas *Bucanus* ſays only, *That the Believer may as freely reject the deſerting Unbeliever in ſuch a Caſe, as a Chriſtian ought to do an Heretick*; but ſuppoſe it were otherwiſe, he is ſtill againſt Mr. *Butler*, in that he ſuppoſes Application ought to be made to the Magiſtrate, who cannot properly be ſaid to neglect what is never brought before him, as it is evident Mr. *Butler* never did; for his Wife, and not he, is the Complainant.

His other Quotations are all to the ſame Purpoſe, not one of them ſpeaks one word of allowing the Deſerted Perſon to marry again, without Application made to a Competent Judge, which were, indeed, to ſubvert all Order and Government; for tho the Caſe be plain by the Law of God and Man, *that a Murderer ought to be put to Death*, and *That an Adulterer may be divorced*, and the Innocent Party lawfully marry again; yet no Man in his right Wit did ever allow, that a private Man, on his own Authority, ſhould put a Murderer to Death, or Divorce his Wife, and marry another; for all the

Laws

Laws of God and Men, tho never so positive require a Legal and Publick Execution and due Enquiry into the Matter of Fact, so that what Mr. *Butler* advances, *p.* 17. *That because the Text saith, If she will depart let her go, there needs no sentence of the Magistrate in the Case, will conclude as much against the need of the Magistrates sentence in Case of Murder, because the Text says, Whosoever sheds Mans blood, by Man shall his blood be shed*; And the like in all other Crimes. Otherwise according to this Principle, every Man may be Judge, Jury, and Executioner in his own Case, which would immediately destroy all Humane Society; such are the profound Politicks of our Concubinary Casuist, being directly contrary to the procedure of the Almighty himself, who tho our first Parents were convicted by his Omniscience and their our Conscience, yet He did not proceed to sentence against them, till the Matter was proved by their own Confession.

I come next to consider what our Author offers in defence of that he calls, *A Lawful Concubinage in a Case of a necessity, wherein Lawful Marriage conveniently or possibly cannot be obtain'd.*

If I had time to examine his Proposition Narrowly, it were no hard matter to prove it a Rhapsody of Contradictions or downright *Bulls*; for there can be no such thing as a *Lawful Concubinage*, nor any case almost wherein

wherein *Lawful Marriage is not possible to be obtain'd*; but I pass that at present, and come to his instance, by which he endeavours to make Good this Monstrous Doctrine. The first is, that of himself, and his first Wife, *Martha Perkins*, who, *p.* 21. he says, liv'd almost Forty Years together in Concubinage. Now to *Live in Concubinage with a Wife is at best but an Irish sort of English*; but we shall let that alone and come to his Reason, which is, because they were not Married directly according to the Custom of the Church of *England*, the Minister having made some blunders and mistakes; And yet *p.* 4. he own'd that she was his Lawful Wife, so that here she's both a *Lawful Wife, and a Concubine at the same time*: Then a little lower, because he would be sure to have Company enough, he says, *That all those Thousands of Marriages that were made from the Rupture betwixt King* Charles I. *and his Parliament, to the time of* Charles II's. *Restoration, by Justices, Quakers,* &c. *were all of them but meer Concubinage,* and that those Marriages were as much illegal as those, without any Ceremony at all, till they were all made good by the Act of Indemnity of the 12th *Car.* 2. But then at the Foot of the Page he spoils all again, by saying, *That according to the Holy Writ, there's no more Ceremony requir'd, but consent on both Parts, before Witness sufficient, and bedding together, according to* Exod. 12.

26. I suppose he would have said, *Deut.* 22. 16.) *Without any presence necessarily requir'd of either Magistrate or Priest.* And so now he deals alike, both with his Brethren the Priests and the Justices of Peace, for there was neither t' one nor t' other present to see our Author go to Bed with his Maid, after *Forty Years Concubinage with his Wife*; So that he has spent a great deal of pains to prove that which no body ever doubted, that these Marriages may be good in the sight of God, that are not such according to the Laws of some Kings and Countreys. But the mystery lies in the Application and Consequence, *Viz. That his Marriage, or rather Concubinage with his Maid, is Lawful in the sight of God, tho not according to the Laws of the Land.* But now I must beg his leave to shew him the difference of the Case. At that time there was a Law, or at least a Power enjoining Marriages by Justices, *&c.* And forbidding Marriage according to the Book of Common Prayer, on pain of Forty Shillings for each offence, as he says, p. 2. and Mr. *Butler* is so good a Minister of the *True Church of England*, that he asserts those Marriages by Justices may be good, setting aside the Statutes and Laws of this Realm. But there was no Power nor Law allowing Mr. *Butler*, or any Man to go to his Maids Bed and live with her as his Wife, (his other Wife being still alive) without application either to Magistracy or Mini-

ſtry, or the Preſence of any Witneſſes for ought that appears. And becauſe I perceive he is much for Clandeſtine Marriages, I muſt refer him to his dearly beloved *Old-Teſtament*, where he will find *Ruth*, Chap. 4. Ver. 9. That *Boaz*'s Marriage with *Ruth* was ſolemniz'd in the Preſence of the Elders; who, together with the People, pray'd for a Bleſſing upon 'em; and *Deut.* 22. 16. he will alſo find that the Tryal of the Brides Virginity was to be made, by producing the Tokens of it before the Elders, which ſhews, that the *Old-Teſtament* Marriages were Publick, and that the Solemnization and Diſſolution of them depended on the Authority of the Magiſtrate, whereas Mr. *Butler* conſulted them in neither Caſe.

Our Author in the next place, p. 22. *alledges that God did plainly allow of a Lawful Concubinage, or Additional Wives for the Bed, for Iſſues ſake; the Iſſue whereof are no where term'd Baſtards, either in Old or New Teſtament, but upon all Occaſions in caſe of Heirs Male, wanting by the proper Wife, the Sons of Concubinage became Heirs; thus* Iſhmael, *Son of* Abraham, *by his Maid-Servant, ſhould have been Heir, if* Iſaac *had not been born of* Sarah, Gen. 17. 18. *And thus* Rehoboam, *Son of* Solomon, *by* Naamah, *a meer Concubine, was his Heir unto his Throne, for that he had no Son by his proper Wife; yea, tho Daughters he had ſeveral. And thus* Jepthah, *Son of* Gilead, *by a*

Stranger,

Stranger, or a meer Concubine, became the Prince of the People before any of his Brethren, born of the lawful Wife, because of his Abilities above any of 'em; Judges 11. 2. 11. *which had he been a Baſtard, could not have been; For a Baſtard might not enter into any Office in the Church, to become ſo much as a Conſtable or Church-warden, much leſs a King or a Judge*, Deut. 23. 2. *but was to remain a Slave, equal to the* Gibeonites, *a Hewer of Wood, and a Drawer of Water: And at this rate none were eſteem'd Baſtards, but Children, begotten in Adultery or Whoredome, of another Man's Wife, or of a Common Whore, and ſuch could not inherit. Inceſt was a foul Sin, and yet the Children, born of Inceſt, did inherit, and were not reputed Baſtards*; as Pharez, *Son of* Judah, *by his Son's Widow, and* Janna, *Son of* Joſeph Arſes, *by his Neece; Both which were Heirs in the Genealogy of our Saviour, and therefore no Baſtards: But the Pope made* Baſtards *of ſuch, which by God's Laws are reputed well-born; and from the Pope our Statute-Laws ſtill keep up the Practiſe, declaring all Children to be* Baſtards *which are born out of Marriage; ſo as Children begot out of Marriage, was a Sin againſt the King's Laws and Statutes, and yet no Sin againſt God's Law.* Theſe are our Author's own Words, becauſe I would give him fair Play, and let his Arguments appear in their native Beauty and Strength.

I anſwer, *Had God allowed of Additional Wives for Iſſue ſake, we ſhould have it ſomewhere mention'd in Holy Writ, and let our Author produce a Text for it if he can.* If God allow'd Additional Wives, how came it that he made but one for *Adam*, and that one too, we have God's own Word for it was a *Meet-help*, *Gen.* 18. 29. which could not be true, if more Wives than one were neceſſary for one Man. The Prophet *Malachi*, *c.* 2. 15. when he Expoſtulates with the People of *Iſrael*, for dealing treacherouſly with the Wife of their Youth, and reproves them for their Divorces, argues in the ſame manner, *viz. Did he not make one, yet had he the Reſidue of the Spirit, and wherefore one? That he might ſeek a Godly Seed, therefore take heed to your Spirit, and let none deal treacherouſly againſt the Wife of his Youth*; which the Criticks Paraphraſe or Interpret thus: *An non unam duntaxat Conjugem Adamo fecit, non plures uxores uni viro. Revocat hic Judæos ad Puram conjugii Naturam & primam Inſtitutionem:* And again, *Quamvis plures animas creare poſſit quas inderet pluribus Mulieribus Adamo jungendis neque enim defecit eum in una Muliere Spiritus, id autem quum non fecerit Argumento hoc certe eſt, quod nolit uni viro plures uxores jungi. Quorſum autem unum, nempe unum illum hominem conſtantem ex viro & Muliere, hoc unice Scilicet agebat, ut haberet Legitimam Sobolem; Oſtendit enim ſpurios*

fore

fare qui ex Polygamia Naſcentur, quia non Gignuntur Secundum Dei Inſtitutionem. Attenti ſitis igitur ad Cavendum ne perfide agatis, vel Spiritu (hoc eſt animo) veſtro, ne datam fidem primæ uxori violetis alia ſuperinducta, i. e. " Did he not make one Wife for " *Adam*, and not divers Wives for one " Man? Here he Recalls them to the pure " Nature of *Wedlock*, and firſt *Inſtitution of* " *Marriage*. Altho he could have created " more Souls, to put into more Women, " to be joyn'd to *Adam*; for the Life that " he breath'd into *Eve*, he could have " breathed into more; but whereas he " did not do ſo; It is certainly an Argu- " ment, that he would not have one Man " to have more Wives than one. And why " did he make one, that is to ſay, one " Man, conſiſting of Male and Female? On- " ly for this end, that there might be a " Lawful Off-ſpring; by which he ſhews, " that the Children, born of *Polygamy*, " ſhould be ſpurious, becauſe not begot " according to the Inſtitution of God. There- " fore take heed, watch over your Spirits, " that you don't ſo much, as in your Mind, " violate the Troth, which you have pligh- " ted to your firſt Wife, by bringing in " another upon her. The Authors of this Expoſition are *Capellus*, *Calvin*, *Piſcator*, *Ludovicus de Dieu*, *Menochius*, *Tarnovius*, &c. as may be ſeen in *Pool's Synopſis*. So that

here is the Prophet *Malachi*, and many Divines of great Note of an Opinion, contrary to Mr. *Butler*, *viz.* that God never allowed Additional Wives, and always accounted the Children of *Polygamy* Spurious, or Baſtards. And as for our Author's Diſtinction, *p.* 21. *That every Man was to Marry but one Woman, who was to be Lady, or Dame of the Family*; I have already ſhew'd him from *Lev.* 18. 18. *That no Man was to take a Wife to her Siſter* (the *Hebrew* Phraſe, for two Wives together) *to vex her, to uncover her Nakedneſs, beſides the other in her Life time.* Now the Reaſon of the Wifes being vex'd, is plainly ſaid to be the Uncovering of the others Nakedneſs; and Mr. *Butler* knows by Experience, that the Uncovering of a Concubines Nakedneſs vexes his Wife; and therefore the Reaſon is as ſtrong againſt *Concubines*, as if they were *Ladies*, or *Dames of the Family*, as well as ſhe he calls the *one Wife*.

As to his Argument from *Iſhmael*'s being to ſucceed *Abraham*, as his Heir, if *Iſaac* had not been born: It's no Argument that God approv'd *Concubinage*, nor does our Author find any where that God had commanded that *Iſhmael* ſhould ſucceed in that Caſe; but it's plain that he was ſent awa by God's Order; that he ſhould not partake of the Inheritance with *Iſaac*, *Gen.* 21. 10 and 12. *ver.* compared, becauſe he

was

was the Son of a Bond-woman, so that this Instance makes against Mr. *Butler*.

Then as to *Reboboam*, Mr. *Butler* owns that *Solomon* had no other Son; Besides, the Succession's being continued upon him, was by a special Decree, as appears, 1 *Kin.* 11. 35. *To his Son will I give one Tribe, that* David, *my Servant, may have always a Light before me in* Jerusalem: So that this is nothing to his Purpose. The Kindness was to *David*, and not to *Reboboam*, as the Son of a Concubine; And here 'tis fit to take Notice that the Instance, of passing by *Solomon*'s Daughters by his proper Wife, as Mr. *Butler* calls her, *makes against his beloved Doctrine of the Divine Right of a Lineal Succession.*

Then, as to *Jepthah*'s being a Judge, if our Author had but look'd to the second Verse of the 11th. Chapter of the *Judges*, he would find that his Brethren would allow him no Part of the Inheritance, for that very Reason, *because he was the Son of a strange Woman*; which is plainly against Mr. *Butler*, and shews that the Sons of Concubines were not judged to have any Right of Inheritance. But that does not hinder, but the People might chuse such an one for a Judge, Commander or General, in time of Distress, and Disorder, as the times of the Judges were; when every Man did what was Right in his own Eyes, there being

being at that time no King in *Israel*, *Judg.* 21. 25. Besides, our Author owns that *Jephthah* was chosen Judge for his Abilities, and not because of his Birthright.

As to the Law mentioned, *Deut.* 23. 2. a Bastard shall not enter into the Congregation of the Lord; Commentators understand that to be meant by Children of a Common Whore. Whereas in these times of Ignorance, that God winked at, Concubines, were solemnly Married, and were accounted a sort of Wives, and the Man's Property, to whom they were so Married; and that *Jephthah*'s Mother was a privare Concubine, any Man, who will consult the Criticks, may find to have been the Opinion of *Munsterus* and *Cornelius a Lapide*. But suppose it had been otherwise, tho God imposes a Law upon us, he imposes none upon himself, so that he may dispense with it when he pleases. And if he did so in this Case, and others of the like Nature, to let those unhappy Children see that he extended Mercy to them, notwithstanding the Sins of their Parents, that all such might not be driven to Despair of his Goodness; what says that in Excuse of *Polygamy*? —— Our Author may as well defend Incest from this Topick, (which yet he owns to be a foul Crime) because, as he observes himself, *Pharez*, the Incestuous Son of *Judah*, by his Daughter-in-Law *Tamar*, succeeded as Heir

to

to his Father, and is mention'd in our Saviour's Genealogy. Who dare or can limit the Holy One of *Israel*, who hath said, *he will have Mercy, on whom he will have Mercy.* Of this Opinion our Author may also find *Peter Martyr*, and *Cornelius* a *Lapide*; And as to *Pharez* and *Janna*, mention'd in our Saviour's Genealogy, *Matth.* 1. and *Luk.* 2. It may be solved the same way. God of his Soveraign Grace chuses and purifies whom he pleases; nor is it any Imputation upon our Saviour, that he was related unto, as well as came to save the chief of Sinners. *Non dedignatur Christus ex peccatricibus & Gentilibus nasci*, say *Lucas Brugensis Maldonatus & Cajetan, quia venit ut utrasque salvaret*, Christ did not disdain to derive his Pedigree from sinful Women and *Gentiles*, because he came into the World to save both of 'em. So that this makes nothing at all for our Author's Purpose, for the same Argument will conclude as strongly, that God approves Murder, Adultery, Incest, Common-Whores, and Heathenism; because *Bathsheba*, *Thamar*, *Rachel*, and *Ruth*, are mention'd in our Saviour's Genealogy, Whereas it only shews the exceeding Riches of God's Grace, in extending so much Compassion to the worst of Sinners. For, that *Bathsheba* was an Adultress, and became *David*'s Wife, by Murder, is plain; that *Thamar* was an Incestuous Adultress, and her Children, *Pharez* and *Zara*, Bastards,

Baſtards cannot be denied, and that *Judah* begot thoſe Children upon her, as a Common Harlot, is obvious to any one that Reads the Story; that *Rahab* was a Common Proſtitute is no leſs known, and no Body can diſpute that *Ruth* was a *Moabiteſs*; But of all theſe we may ſay with the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9. Such they were once, but at laſt were waſhed, ſanctified, and juſtified, in the Name of the Lord Jeſus.

As to his unmannerly Reflection upon our Statute Laws, that declare all Children born out of Marriage to be Baſtards, *As if they were deriv'd from the Pope*, Let the Government look to it; but this looks indeed like Mr. *Butler's* Politicks and Divinity. He might know that the Holy Scripture calls ſuch *Baſtards*, Deut. 23. 2. *Quivis extra Legitimum, conjugium natus* ſays, *Gerundenſis*, any one born out of Lawful Marriage: And if it do not call the Children of Concubines by that Name, becauſe of the Reſpect due to Marriage, tho unlawfully Contracted; It does not follow, but that in effect they really were ſuch. And therefore our Law which admits of no Concubinage, has reaſon to call all Children begot out of Marriage Baſtards, Whether ever the Pope had done ſo or not. Our Author knows, that the Scripture does not call *Pharez* and *Zara* Baſtards, tho they really were ſo, as being not only Begot out of Lawful *Wedlock*, but in horrid Inceſt, where-

as

as *Judah* thought he had to do with a Common-Harlot. And therefore his Argument from the Scriptures, not calling every one in particular, Begot in Concubinage, or other unlawful Manner Baſtards, has no weight at all, eſpecially ſeeing it is plain, that it calls all thoſe Begot out of *Wedlock* in General, by that Name.

I come next to our Authors Hiſtorical Inſtances, *p.* 23. and 24. The firſt is the *Parliament of* Scotland's *Legitimation of the Sons of* Robert Stuart, *King of* Scots, *by* Elizabeth Moor, *his Concubine; and his being ſucceeded by* John, *the Eldeſt of thoſe Sons by Concubinage, notwithſtanding he had Two Sons by his Lawful Wife* Eupham, *Daughter to the Earl of* Roſſe, *then living.*

I anſwer, 1. The Practice of *Scotland*, or any other Nation in this Caſe, ſuppoſe it were true as our Author lays it down, *Viz.* That the Reaſons moving them ſo to do, *Were that ſhe had been a true Wife to him, before God in all things, excepting the deficiency of the Rites and Ceremonies of Marriage*, Is no Rule to us, nor cannot warrant our Conſcienees. But our Author may pleaſe to know that there have been diſcoveries made ſince, which make it highly probable, that *Robert Stuart* was Married to *Elizabeth Moor*, whilſt he was a private Man, tho he thought fit for Reaſons of State to conceal it when he came to the Crown, and this is urg'd by Sir *Geo. Mackenzie*,

zie, and others, in Defence of the Royal Line of *Scotland*. But ſuppoſing it were not ſo, his Sons by *Elizabeth Moor*, were Legitimated by the Parliament of that Kingdom, which formerly was the Supreme Power of that Nation; and if we may believe their Hiſtories, gave Laws to their Kings but receiv'd none from them: So that they ſet up, Dethron'd, and Puniſh'd their Kings, as they thought fit. A plain inſtance of this, is that Letter to the Pope from the States of *Scotland*, in the time of *Edw.* I. as is to be ſeen in Dr. *Burnets* Hiſtory of the Reformation, *Wherein they tell him that they had Dethron'd* John Baliol, *for ſuch and ſuch Cauſes, and choſen* Robert Bruce, *whom they would alſo Dethrone if he committed the like Miſdemeanours.* They afterwards ſettled the Succeſſion upon the ſaid *Bruces* Brother and his Iſſue, failing the Kings own Male Iſſue, tho he had a Daughter then living, who was Mother to this very *Robert Stuart*; *So that in thoſe days they believ'd nothing of the Divine Right of Hereditary Lineal Succeſſion.* They afterwards made an Act in *Robert Bruces* time, *that in Caſe of any diſpute about the Succeſſion, it ſhould be decided by the Parliament, and the King of* France *by his League was oblig'd to aſſiſt him with Arms, to whom they adjudg'd the Crown.* After King *James* the Third was ſlain in Battle near *Sterlin*, the firſt Parliament held by his Son, enacted, *That ſuch as fell on the King's*

King's side, were Lawfully slain, as Enemies to the Publick, not so much as excepting himself: And that those who fought against him, were no way Culpable. Nay, this present Parliament of *Scotland* declar'd, that the *Late King James had forfeited their Crown*, and did not trouble themselves to debate whether he had abdicated or not. So that to argue from an Act of Parliament in *Scotland*, relating to their Government, to a particular Case, like that of our Authors, is to argue, *de Genere in Genus*, quite Forraign to his purpose; and shews him to be as Ignorant of the Laws of Argument, as undeserving of the Character of a true Church of *England-Man*, to take Presidents from a Countrey who always had a Mortal hatred to passive obedience: But besides in admitting the *Scotish* Race to this Crown; our Ancestors did not trouble themselves with the Question, whether they were Lawfully begot or not? But whether King *James* I. was descended in the Eye of the Law from our *Hen.* VIIth? For if we may believe some of the *Scotch* Historians, there was Reason enough to question that Princes Birth, without going any further back. But it seems our Ancestors were as much resolv'd to have him for their King as the Protestant *Scots* were, of whom th: Earl of *Glencarn*, then one of the chief, is quoted by some of their Writers for saying to his Mother, when she to avoid being Dethron'd, her

her self, gave plain enough hints that he was none of the most Lawful Issue, *They knew that if his Stone Horse had begot him he should be King of Scots*: They considered him as born in Lawful *Wedlock*, without troubling themselves to enquire whether he was Lawfully begot, and tho they knew, they had no great reason to admire her Chastity, they knew also that she had too much Interest to say, that he was spurious to be believed. The same Answer is enough to his other Instances of *William* the Conqueror and *Henry* VIIth. Their Claims were Authoriz'd by Parliaments, who in Extraordinary Cases must consult the Publick welfare (for *Salus Populi suprema lex*, is a Maxim that will hold Eternally true) and are not to be Governed by the Notions of Clergy-Men, no more then our Late Parliaments were by their false Notions of Passive obedience, when they settled the Crown upon King *William* and Queen *Mary*, *&c.* Moreover, seeing this Law about the Imploying of Bastards in places of Authority was not giv'n to us, and also dispens'd with by the *Jews*, to whom it was giv'n, there's no Reason that any Christian Nation should look upon themselves as oblig'd by it, when the welfare of the State does indispensibly require the setting up of such an one, so that all our Authors Arguments from hence to prove Concubinage Lawful, vanish into smoak. Besides *Bonfrerius* and *Oleaster* are of Opinion, that it was Forraign Bastards, and not those of their own

People

People that were here prohibited, because *Pharez* tho a Bastard was admitted into the Congregation, and *Jepthah*, &c. Made a Judge, and the Reason of the prohibition, Commentators think to be, that Bastards were Generally accounted Vile in the Eyes of their own People, neglected in their Education, and so unfit for Government.

Our Authors next Argument, *Of Priests Marriage being formerly cried down, but now accounted Lawful is nothing to the purpose*; The Lawfulness of that was always clearly demonstrable from the Scriptures, but so was not that of Concubinage.

Mr. *Butler*, p. 27. Says, *I am of Opinion we may find some other matters still spoken against that, may upon serious consideration be found as Innocent and Holy as that* (meaning Priests Marriage) *is at this day, and among other things, I propose a Lawful Concubinage as in some Cases it may be required, and to this purpose it is Written in the New Testament*, Heb. 13. 4. *That Marriage is Honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled, but Whoremongers and Adulterers God will Judge.* Then he argues, *that by Bed undefil'd is meant some other Bed different from the Marriage Bed, because the Word* καὶ *is a Copulative, which Couples sentences of a distinct signification, for that which is the same thing in sense with that which went before needs no Bond of Copulation, for if the Author had intended one and the same thing, by these words he would have said Marriage (being) or which is a Bed undefil'd.* I

Answer,

Anſwer, This Poor Man is put to miſerable ſhifts, to lull his own Conſcience aſleep, and to gull thoſe of others, 'twill grant him that καὶ Couples ſentences of different ſignifications here, and that *Marriage and Bed undefil'd are different things*, but how will that prove, that there's any other Bed betwixt a Man and a Woman undefil'd except the Marriage Bed? Is it not plain, that the Bed may be defil'd by Married Perſons? Mrs. *Butler ſays our Author defil'd her* Bed *while ſhe was Married to him.* So that tho Marriage be Honourable, that does not ſay, but Married Perſons may Diſhonour themſelves by defiling the Marriage Bed, which by God and Man is always accounted more Diſhonourable then Fornication betwixt Perſons unmarried, and therefore the Apoſtles ſenſe is plain, *Marriage is Honourable, and to keep the Marriage* Bed *undefil'd is Honourable, but thoſe that commit Fornication, and thoſe that Defile the Marriage bed by Adultery, God will Judge.* That this is the plain meaning of the Text, may be evinc'd thus, the Apoſtle propoſes Marriage as Honourable in oppoſition to Fornication, which is Leudneſs betwixt unmarried Perſons; therefore ſays the Apoſtle Marriage is Honourable, but God will Judge Fornicators. πόρνους, that is ſays *Grotius*, *Venere utentes extra Conjugium*, unmarried Perſons who lie together, and the Bed undefil'd is Honourable, continues the Apoſtle, but God will Judge Adulterers; μοιχοὺς That is, ſuch

ſuch as Defile the Marriage-Bed, unmarried Perſons have none to Defile. Beſides, there may be a Defiling of the Marriage Bed, even betwixt Married Perſons, by Incontinence, and the Immoderate Uſe of it.

Mr. *Butler* owns *P.* 8. that he himſelf was guilty of Incontinence, with the Complainant *Martha*, whileſt his Wife, which certainly was a Defiling of the Marriage Bed. *Calvin* ſays upon the place, *Cubile Impollutum additur ut Sciant conjugati non quidvis ſibi Liceri, ſed uſum thori Legitimi debere eſſe Moderatum ne quid alienum à Conjugij pudore & Caſtimonia admittant.* i. e. The Bed Undefiled is added, that married Perſons may know that their Liberty is not boundleſs, but that the Uſe of the Lawful Bed ought to be moderate, leſt they ſhould commit ſomething unbecoming the Modeſty of Wedlock, or Chaſtity; and ſo if Mr. *Butler* went to Bed with his Wife, during his Incontinence, when he ought to have been at Prayers in the Church, or Viſiting the Sick, *&c.* it was a thing unbecoming Wedlock and Chaſtity; ſo that here he ſees that Marriage and the Bed Undefiled are things as much different, as Mr. *Butler, the Husband of Martha Perkins*, and Mr. *Butler, not a Concubinary afterwards with Mary Tomkins*, or any other Woman; or Mr. *Butler in Bed with his Wife at Lawful Seaſons*, and Mr. *Butler not in Bed with his Wife when he ſhould be Viſiting the Sick.* *Junius, Piſcator,*

Piscator, *Gerundensis*, *Gataker*, *Menochius*, *Tirinus*, and others, do all understand this Word Undefiled to be meant of the Marriage-Bed, tho some of 'em will have it to be Periphrastical, and others Preceptive; and Mr. *Butler* himself instances a Case, wherein he owns the Word *Kai* to be Exegetical, or Explanatory of the thing preceeding, *viz. Ephes* 1 3. *Blessed be God, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*; which the same Apostle writes, 2 *Cor.* 1. 3. *Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, in which the Particle, *and* is Exegetical.

But says Mr. *Butler*, p. 28. *That if we read the Words thus*; *Marriage, ev'n the Bed undefiled, is honourable: There will be a Riddle in the Case*; *for why did he make account that Marriage could not be honourable, unless it were a Bed undefiled? No, that could not be, for Marriage of it self is an honourable State, in all Cases and Persons: And again it would follow, that all Marriages are, even a Bed undefiled, which is not so*; *for there are very many Profane and Unclean Marriages*; *and therefore the Holy Author treats of a Bed undefiled, plainly distinct and different from a Marriage-Bed, that may truly be stiled a Lawful and Undefiled Bed*, &c.

This is a very odd way of arguing. I have shew'd that there's no necessity of reading the Words so, and that most Commentators take them to be spoke of the Marriage-Bed, but under different Considerations,

ons, *viz.* as Defiled and Undefiled. Our Author also runs into Contradictions; for in one Line he says, *Marriage is honourable in all Cases, even, tho the Bed be not Undefiled*; and in a few Lines after says, *There are very many Prophane and Unclean Marriages.* Let him reconcile this if he can: As to his Q. if the Apostle did not account Marriage Honourable, unless it were a Bed Undefiled; it's downright Impertinent; Marriage is appointed as a Remedy for keeping the Bed Undefiled: The Apostle's Meaning is plain enough, that Marriage was Honourable, but it was very Dishonourable in married Persons to Defile the Marriage-Bed, either by the Immoderate Use of it betwixt themselves, or by taking others into it. *Calvin* and others, I have quoted for the former, and for the latter, *Gataker* and others comment upon it thus: It is as much as if he should say, *Thorus Maritalis, nulla contaminetur Macula, Adulterii aut ullius peccati contra fidem conjugalem. i. e.* Let not the Marriage-Bed be Defiled by any Spot, either of Adultery, or any other Crime against the Conjugal Vow. As to what our Author alledges, that there are many Prophane and Unclean Marriages, those are none of God's Appointment, and the Apostle treats here only of such: I do believe that his Marriage with *Mary Tomkins* is Prophane and Unclean, if it can be accounted any Marriage at all; but to be plainer

with him, there can be no ſuch thing properly ſpeaking, as an Unclean Marriage, tho ſome Unclean Perſons may perhaps marry only for Unclean Ends. Marriage is an Holy Ordinance of God, and can never be Unclean, tho many Unclean Practices may be covered under that Name; for every one that marries, does not *marry in the Lord.*

Having thus made it plain, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the *Marriage Bed only*, our Author's Inference, that he ſpeaks of a *Lawful and Undefiled Bed, diſtinct from a Marriage* Bed, falls to the Ground of Courſe.

Mr. *Butler*, *P.* 19. has Recourſe to the Practice of the *Hebrews*, to whom this Epiſtle was writ, to prove this forc'd Commentary he puts upon the Text, for which he neither does nor can quote one Expoſitor; and therefore alledges, *that becauſe the Hebrews always held a Bed of Concubinage to be Undefiled and Honourable; that the Apoſtle muſt needs therefore mean Concubinage by a Bed Undefiled.* I anſwer, 1. That I have already prov'd Concubinage among the *Hebrews* to have been contrary to the Divine Command, tho Conniv'd at in thoſe times of Ignorance: 2. That *Concubinage* could not be the Apoſtle's Meaning; for our Author himſelf will own that Marriage does alſo imply a Bed Undefiled, otherwiſe it could not be Honourable; ſo that it would be Nonſence for the Apoſtle to diſtinguiſh *Concubinage*,

cubinage from Marriage by the Words *Bed Undefiled*, as if it were more properly so, than Marriage it self, which was of Divine Institution. 3. That the Apostle must not be suppos'd to Contradict his Master Jesus Christ, who recall'd Marriage to its first Institution betwixt one Man and one Woman at a time, *Matth.* 19. 4, 5, 6. where he says, *They twain* (not they three, four, or five) *shall be one Flesh*; and instead of our Author's Assertion, that the Apostle approves *Concubinage*, because he wrote to the *Jews*, it's more probable that he reproves it, as our Saviour did their Divorces, in the 19th. of *Matthew*, which *Moses*, because of the Hardness of their Hearts, had suffer'd, and they thereupon thought Lawful. But our Saviour tells them *that from the beginning it was not so*; and it's as plain, that *Polygamy* or *Concubinage* was not from the beginning, so that our Saviours' Argument concludes as strongly against those, as against the Divorces then in Use amongst the *Jews*.

Grotius says, That the Apostle here opposes himself to that Opinion, which many of the Jewish Rabbies maintain'd, *viz.* That it was no Crime to Lie with any Woman, tho not married to her, if she was not a *Jewess*, because they thought *Moses*'s Law only restrain'd them as to such.—Therefore he advises them to take heed, lest there be any Fornicator amongst them, *Heb.* 12. 16.

And in this Text proposes Marriage as a Remedy against Fornication, as has been said already.

This Answer of our Saviour, that *Moses* suffer'd such things, because of the Hardness of their Hearts, is sufficient to put an end to all those Cavils from the *Old Testament* Instances. The *Jews* were a stiff necked People, which is given them in many Places as their Character; and therefore *Moses*, by Divine Permission, suffer'd those things, tho he did not command them; He suffer'd them, to prevent greater Evils; lest they should have murder'd their Wives, or treated them harshly: 2. They were suffer'd, as common Laws of Nations do allow, more than is allow'd by the Laws of Religion, as is clear from this Instance; that in all Christian Kingdoms there are Judges, constituted for deciding Differences betwixt Man and Man, of what Nature soever they may be, for preventing Oppression and Injustice; so that the Bench is open to trivial and frivolous Suits, as well as to those that are weighty and material; yet the Practice of such as go to Law upon every Occasion, is contrary to the Apostle's Command, and Christian Charity, as appears by 1 *Cor.* 1. 6. 3. They were suffer'd as a proper Punishment for their Wickedness; for it both exhausted their Bodies and Estates, and broke the Peace of their own Families, and engaged them

them in Discord with others. 4. This People were given over to a Temporal Fornication, as the *Papists* are to a Spiritual Fornication: But our Saviour, the Second *Adam*, when he came to Redeem the World, restor'd Marriage again to its first Institution, as it was in the First *Adam*'s time.

Mr. *Butler P.* 20. alledges, *that God attested the Legitimacy of* Ishmael's *Birth by the Blessing he gave him.* Our Author, sure, knows it's a Maxim in Divinity, that we must measure God's Will by his Word, and not by his Providence. The Wise Man tells us, that Outward Things happen alike to the Good, and to the Bad. The Text tells us that it was for *Abraham*'s sake that God gave *Ishmael* Temporal Blessings, and so he blessed *Esau* for *Isaac*'s sake; whence our Author may as well conclude, that God approv'd of that Prophane Person. 'Besides, 'it's plain from the Text that *Ishmael* was 'an Accursed Persecutor, had his Hand 'against every Man, and every Man's 'Hand against him; his Posterity we find 'complain'd of *Psalm* 83. amongst other E-'nemies of the People of God. And as 'the Author of the Book, call'd *God's 'Judgments against Whoring*, observes, so 'they have continued under several Denominations to this day; as *Ishmaelites*, *Hagarens*, *&c.* of which latter Name being 'asham'd, as denoting their spurious Ori-

ginal, they assum'd to themselves the Title of *Saracens*, as if they were *Sarah*'s Offspring; under which they were formidable to the Christian World for some Ages, and continue irreconcileable Enemies to the Christian Religion to this day, under the name of *Arabians*, *Turks*, &c. and are so addicted unto Uncleanness, that they place their chief Happiness here and hereafter in the Enjoyment of their Sensual Pleasures. So far was *Ishmael* or his Posterity from being truly blessed; To that Book I refer our Author, where he will find an Elaborate Account of the Punishments, inflicted upon the *Patriarchs* and others, for their Poligamy and Concubinage, which he will needs have *to be a* Bed *Undefiled.*

Page 30. he says, God allow'd of *David*'s Concubinage, because 2 *Sam.* 12. 8. God expostulating with *David*, because of his Adultery with *Bathsheba*, and the Murder of her Husband, says. *And I gave thee thy Masters House, and thy Masters Wives into thy bosom.*

I answer, God gave *David* the Possession of of all that was *Saul*'s, to use Lawfully, but not to use Unlawfully, otherwise he must approve of Incest, for it was not Lawful for any Man to have his Father-in-Law's Wife, nor does it appear that *David* made use of them as Wives. So God is said to give *David*'s Concubines to *Absalom*, which will make him the Author of Incest, if giving do

do always signifie approving; but the meaning is no more then this, that he suffer'd *Absalom* to fall into that Tentation, and took his Restraining Grace from him, that so *David*'s Sin might be punish'd by that of his Son. So God gave *Saul* into *David*'s Hand, yet he himself own'd it was not Lawful for him to kill him. The word in the Original signifies any Women; as *Junius*, and *Cornelius a Lapide* observe; so that it may be meant of *Saul*'s Daughters that were *David*'s Wives: Besides, its plain, if he had added *Saul*'s Wives to those that he had before, he had transgressed the Law, *Deut.* 17. 17. against Kings multiplying Wives; which God would never have approved of. So that the meaning of that place seems to be no more, than that God amongst other things that were *Saul*'s, gave him also his Wife's. But seeing it is doubtful our Author will find but little Stability in it for his Conscience to build upon. His Instance from *Rehoboam*'s Succession in that same Page is answered already, and for that from the Prophet *Hosea*'s being order'd to take another Woman, his own being yet alive. Our Author cannot but know that *Rivet*, and other Interpreters, understand it to be Parabolical to represent God's Love to an Adulterous and Treacherous People: Or if otherwise, he answers himself, when he says, it was by a special Command from God, who may dispens

penſe with his own Law when he pleaſes.

His Inſtance of the Conception of our Saviour, p. 32. is Villainous and Blaſphemous. God form'd *Adam* out of the Duſt by his Omnipotence, and forms us in the Womb *Mediante Generatione*; and can his forming of our Saviour's Humane Nature there, without any ſuch *Medium*, any way import a Violation of Virginity? Does not the immodeſt Man know, that this was altogether Miraculous, and Propheſied of before as ſuch? *Iſaiah* 7. 14. Can any Man not wholly bereft of Senſe, or hardened in Impiety, compare this any way to a Bed out of Marriage? but this Mans Impetuous Luſt makes him flie on the Face of God himſelf.

Page 32. He will have our Saviour to approve of a Bed out of Marriage as Undefiled, *John* 4. 10. becauſe he bleſſed the Woman of *Samaria* and her Husband or Man, with whom ſhe liv'd in Concubinage, without ſo much as reproving her for it, or ordering her to diſcontinue her Courſe of Life; as our Saviour uſed to do in Sinful Caſes; as *John* 8. 11. and 5. 14.

Anſwer. That Chriſt reprov'd her is apparent enough, when he told her, that he whom ſhe then had was not her Husband; and it's plain from her own Words to her Neighbours, that ſhe was touch'd with his Reproof, when ſhe ſaid to them, that he had

had told her all that ever she did in her Life, tho we hear of nothing else but this one matter. All Commentators agree that Christ's telling her, that he whom she had now was not her Husband, was a severe Reproof and a Check to her, for mocking him in asking for Water to quench her Thirst, when he was speaking to her of Water from the Wells of Salvation, and also by endeavouring to deceive him when she told him, that she had no Husband. By her Answer 'tis also plain that she confessed her Crime; I perceive says she, that thou art a Prophet, which was a direct owning of the Truth of what he said. Now her Crime according to *Grotius* and *Lightfoot* in *Hora* was, that she had Five Husbands, from whom she had divorc'd her self contrary to the Law of *Moses*, or had been Five times divorc'd for Adultery, and that she was truly touch'd with a sense of her sin appears, In that she was straightway Sollicitous to know, whether she Worshipped God in a Right manner or not. If our Author consult *Bucer*, *Calvin*, and *Melancton* upon the place, he will find they were fully of this Opinion, that Christ by discoursing her, sought an opportunity to reprove her, and that it was not in sharper Terms, only argues, that he was unwilling to break the bruised Reed. That the Woman was sufficiently sensible of her Faults, appears in this, that she took shame to her self by owning

ing them before all her fellow Citizens, that she was a sincere believer, appears from her Zealous desire to have them made Partakers of the Grace of God, as well as her self, and that she broke off her impure Course of Life, is not to be questioned seeing it is certain she had Faith, which is an Heart purifying Grace, but as to *Her Husbands coming with her, receiving part of the Blessing, and having his Concubinage approv'd*: It is only the Comment of our Concubinary Author, Our Saviour would never Contradict himself by Preaching another Doctrine to her, than he did in *Mat.* 19. And allow her six Husbands at once when he recall'd Marriage there, to its first Institution betwixt one and one.

I come next to consider our Authors description of a Whoremonger, p. 33. *He is says he, such a wretch who tho allow'd to Marry, or to keep his Concubine, that is a Woman proper to himself provided he do not multiply Concubines, nor keep any Woman unlawfully Compassed unto any mans wrong, or to that Womans wrong, and useth her not meerly for his Lust, but out of a pure desire of an Holy Seed by her, yet not contented with that Lawful Liberty, chuseth rather to spend the Holy Seed of mankind upon Common Women, and thus exposeth his Seed to be murdered in the Body.*

Answ. I observe, our Author distinguishes betwixt Marrying and Keeping a Concubine as different things, which plainly overthrows what

what he asserts, for our Saviour, *Mat.* 19. Speaks not one word of allowing a Concubine, but that they that cannot contain should Marry, *v.* 11. 12. The Apostle answerable to this, 1 *Cor.* 7. 2, 9. Proposes Marriage as a Remedy against Fornication and Incontinence, but speaks not one word of a Concubine, and from thence also it is plain, that by Whoremongers the Apostle means such Persons as are not Married, and yet make use of Women, else Marriage were no proper remedy for them, which perfectly destroys Mr. *Butlers* Concubinage, seeing the Apostle doth thereby Condemn all use of Women out of a Married State: As to what our Author says is allowed at *Rome*, and in some Reform'd States (tho there be none of the latter charg'd with any such thing but *Holland*) it's no warrant for any Mans Conscience

For the Sixty Sixth of those called the Apostolical Canons, *Ordering that any Person who deflour'd a Virgin, should either Marry her, or have no other Wife during her Life*: It is nothing to his purpose, but rather against Poligamy and Concubinage.

As to his Instances of *Constantinus Chlorus*, and *Constantine* the Greats having Concubines, and being receiv'd by the Christians into places of Authority notwithstanding, It's Forreign to his purpose, the Christians were Subject to former Emperours who were the worst and leudest of Men, it not being in their

their Power to hinder or advance them at that time, and whatever was the Practice of the Christians then: If they either committed Fornication themselves, or Countenanc'd it in others; they did thereby Act contrary to the *truly Apostolical Canons*, Act. 15. Commanding them to abstain from Fornication, and the repeated Injunctions of the Apostles to flee Fornication, which properly signifies, as has been already prov'd, uncleanness us'd by unmarried Persons; and as for Adultery, or defiling the Marriage Bed, which the said Princes must have been guilty of, by their Concubinage, it's every where Condemned by God and Man, tho the Christians in those times might perhaps neither have Power, nor think it prudent to quarrel with those Emperours that were but just then beginning to see the Dawn of the Gospel Light, which utterly Condemns all such things. Nor can our Author make it appear, but they reprov'd them as well as one of our Bishops did *Henry* VIII. and yet the Protestants did not think fit, neither to quarrel with his own Title to the Crown, nor those of his Successors; tho perhaps there might have been good Reason to Question Queen *Marys* Legittimacy, and yet our Author knows that the Church of *England* neither approves of Concubinage, Incest, nor Adultery; So false and inconcludent is his Argument. Besides, our Author Conceals, that *Constantius Chlorus* was

no

no declared Christian, tho a Great Favourer of 'em, and that he was forc'd to abandon *Helena* and Marry *Theodora*; Step Daughter to the Emperor *Maximianus Hercules*, who thereupon made him *Cæsar*. Nor does he take any notice of *Constantine* the Greats being Married very young to *Minervina*, when it is not certain that he made profession of the Christian Religion, nor yet when he Married *Fausta* Daughter to the Emperour *Maximian*, one of the Greatest haters of the Christians that ever was. Neither does he take notice of the Plague that this wretch'd Woman *Fausta* was to him, for being enamoured on his Son *Crispus* by *Minervina* and not obtaining her end, she accus'd him of a design to Debauch her, for which his Father put him to Death, but understanding the Falsehood of the Accusation afterwards, he put her to Death too. so disastrous were the effects of his Poligamy.

As to *Valentinian*, the Emperor he was passionate in anger even to Madness, and probably as Extravagant in his Amours, the Story is very well known, that his passion to see the Empire Insulted by such an ugly deform'd Barbarous People, as the *Quadi* made him fall into such a fit of anger as that it kill'd him, so that he is no very commendable Pattern to be followed. Neither does Mr. *Butler* take any notice that God did not bless the Marriage of *Valentinian*, with *Justina* his

Wifes

Wifes Maid, for ſhe became a Curſed *Arrian* and his Grandſon *Valentinian* by *Galla*, her Daughter became a cruel Perſecutor of the Orthodox. *Valentinian* did alſo make a Law in Imitation of his own Practice, as Mr. *Butler* Writes in Defence of his, that any Man might Marry two Wives, but ſucceeding Emperors would not allow it, the Honour of being put into the Code. Nor do I believe the Univerſities will Honour Mr. *Butlers* Pamphlet, with a place in any of their Libraries.

As to his falſe pretence of Concubinage, or Poligamies being allowed by the Primitive Church, it is ſo groſs it needs no Confutation. Any Man that has read the Apologies of *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen* againſt *Celſus*, or any thing of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory will find the contrary, and for ſuch as cannot have the opportunity of peruſing thoſe Authors themſelves, I refer them to the Account of what they ſaid on that Head given by the Author of Gods Judgments againſt Whoring at the End of that Book.

Our Authors laſt effort is, *p.* 34. Where he propoſes, *a Reformed Concubinage to theſe Realms, for preventing the Ruine of Royal Noble and Generous Families, and as an honeſt help to deſtroy thoſe foul and crying Sins of Whoredom and Adultery, which Ruine Kingdoms as well as Families.* His Arguments to back this propoſal

Propoſal are, *that had it not been for Concubinage, King* Solomon *had utterly fail'd of that Royal Race, whence Jeſus Chriſt Lineally deſcended. That if* Alexander *the* Scot *had uſed a Concubine, an Heir of his Body might have prevented thoſe dreadful Wars betwixt* Bruce *and* Baliol *for that Crown. That if* Richard *the II. had been allowed an Heir by a Concubine, the War betwixt the Houſes of* Lancaſter *and* York *had been prevented; which at laſt was not ended but by a Son, ſprung from a Bed of Concubinage.* He concludes thus; *Happy was that Concubinage of* Robert *the II. of* Scotland, *which adviſed to by a Parliament of that Nation, gave Birth to that Family of the* Stuarts, *which have made both* England *and* Scotland *exceeding happy; and being grafted into the Family of the* Welch *Tudors of the Royal Blood of* England, *another Family ſprang from a Bed of Concubinage, are to this day reigning over both Kingdoms: Which, if ſo, let no Man by Corrupt and Unlawful Cuſtoms, go about to ſtain the Legitimacy of ſuch a Race of Princes,*

as both England *and* Scotland *have Reaſon to remember with Praiſe and Thankſgiving to God; eſpecially for* Charles *the I. of Bleſſed and Never-dying Memory, the Gracious Gift of God, for whoſe bleſſed ſake Good Things may juſtly be expected in time, both unto his Royal Race, and theſe his Kingdoms. And thus much may ſerve, in Vindication of this Reſpondent for Bedding with* Mary Tomkins.

Our Author here, as every where elſe, hath diſcover'd himſelf to be a Phyſitian of no Value; for if they may be call'd ſo, who preſcribe a Remedy worſe than the Diſeaſe, then certainly he deſerves that Title. Suffering is always preferable to Sin; and it's better that Ten Thouſand Families ſhould be Extinguiſh'd, than that any one Man ſhould run the risk of his Soul, to keep them up. Mr. *Butler*'s Paſſion for *Concubinage* doth ſo effectually blind him, that he can't ſee an Inch before his Noſe; for had he but look'd into that very Inſtance of *Robert Stuart*'s Concubinage, he might have ſeen what

Bucha-

Buchanan, the *Scotch* Hiſtorian, ſays concerning it, *viz. Qua res poſtea tam numeroſam familiam prope Extinxit*, i. e. Which Affair had well-nigh extinguiſh'd that numerous Family afterward. And becauſe our Author reckons this one of the happieſt Inſtances that can be, to advance Concubinage. I ſhall treſpaſs upon the *Reader*'s Patience a little, to demonſtrate the contrary.

In the firſt place, our Author aſſerts falſly, that this Concubinage was adviſed by the Parliament, whereas it is plain, that if ſhe was his Concubine at all, it was when a private Man: For *Buchanan* ſays he married her after Queen *Eupham*'s Death; ſo that then ſhe was no Concubine. In the next place he falſly belies the Family of the *Stuarts*, in ſaying that this Concubinage gave Birth to them; for both *Cambden* and *Buchanan* derive their Original from *Banchо Thane* of *Loghnaber*, of the Blood-Royal of *Scotland*; who being murder'd by *Mackbeth*, the Tyrant, about the Year of our Lord, 1050. his Son *Fleanchus* fled into *North-Wales*, where

he married the Daughter of *Griffith Lewellin*, Prince of the Country, and by her had a Son, call'd *Walter*; who being a Valiant Man, and Favourite to King *Malcolm* III. that kill'd *Mackbeth*, he was (for defeating the *Galloway* Rebels, and killing their General,) created Lord Steward of *Scotland*, whence the Family took Sirname; and *Robert*, whom we now treat of, being Son to another *Walter Stuart*, by King *Robert Bruce*'s Daughter, was the first of 'em, who enjoy'd the Crown: So that Mr. *Butler* wrongs the Royal Family, both as to the Honour of their Original, which was Lawful, and not Spurious; and also as to their Antiquity, by 320 Years, for so long had they been call'd by the Name of *Stuart*, before they came to the Crown.

But then, as to the Effects of this Concubinage, they were the most direful that almost any History gives an Account of: For *John*, the Eldest Son, by *Elizabeth Moor*; who, when he came to the Crown, was call'd *Robert* the III. because of the Hatred the *Scots* had

had to the Name of *John*, on the Account of *John Baliol*, who betray'd their Liberty to our *Edward* I. and the ill Fate of King *John* of *France*, and King *John* of *England*. This *Robert*, I say, had nothing of the Spirit of Government, so that he was tyranniz'd over by his Brother *Robert*, the second Son of *Elizabeth Moor*, who starved his eldest son, Prince *David*, to Death, in the Castle of *Falkland*, and forc'd the younger, call'd *James*, (afterwards *James* the I. of *Scotland*) to flee the Kingdom, and he was taken by the *English*, as bound to *France*. *Alexander* the youngest of *Elizabeth Moor*'s Sons, was a bloody cruel Man; and besides other Inhumane Acts, burnt the famous Cathedral of *Elgin*, the finest in all *Scotland*, because he could not find the Bishop of *Murray*, whom he design'd to have murder'd. And his Son *Alexander* was as barbarous as the Father; and Plunder'd and Murder'd his Neighbours. The Misfortune of Prince *James* afflicted his Father, King *Robert*, so sensibly, that he refused to

be comforted; and ſtarv'd himſelf to Death. After which, his Brother, the Inhumane *Robert*, Reign'd under the Title of Governour; and not only kept his Nephew, *James*, from the Crown, during his Life, but left the Government to his own Son *Murdo*, who alſo kept it in his own Hands; till being diſoblig'd by the Rebellious Temper of his own Sons, he ſummoned a Parliament, and by their Advice call'd home King *James* I. from *England*; who, after his Return, made a terrible Havock among the other Princes of the Blood; cut off *Murdo Stuart*, Duke of *Albany*, and his two Sons, and baniſhed others of the Name. Upon which, *James*, Duke *Murdo*'s youngeſt Son, ſurpriz'd and kill'd the King's Uncle, and fled into *Ireland*. The Hiſtorian obſerves, that all this Diſorder and Diſcord in the Royal Family, was fomented by *Walter*, Earl of *Athol*, eldeſt Son to King *Robert Stuart*, by Queen *Euphaim*, his Lawful Wife, his Deſign being to have all the Poſterity of *Elizabeth Moor*, the Concubine, extinguiſh'd, that ſo the Crown might

might devolve upon himſelf; which he thought might be eaſily effected, if he could but have got King *James* the I. taken off; which he likewiſe compaſſed, having procured him to be murther'd in his Bed-Chamber, as he lodg'd in the *Dominicans* Cloyſter near Perth, on a Journey. Upon which, the Nobility aſſembling from all parts of the Kingdom, they purſued the Murderers with ſo much Vigor, that all the Conſpirators were put to Death in 40 Days: And *Walter*, Earl of *Athol*, who was the Author of the Conſpiracy, and *Robert Graham*, who actually murder'd the King, were put to death in ſuch a cruel manner, that the *Reader* will not think his time loſt to peruſe the Account of it, as follows. *Walter*'s Execution took up three Days; on the firſt he was put into a Cart, to which there was an Engine faſtned, that hoiſted him up by Ropes and Pullies, and let him down again to the Ground, which rack'd and looſened all his Joints, and put him to incredible Pain; then he was ſet on a Pillory, with a Red-hot

Iron Crown on his Head, and this Motto; The King of all Traytors, which was reckon'd the Accompliſhment of what had been foretold him by Witches, whom he had Conſulted to know whether he ſhould come to the Crown or not, *viz.* That he ſhould be crown'd in a great Concourſe of People. The ſecond Day he was bound upon a Hurdle, and dragg'd at a Horſes Tail through *Edinburgh.* On the third he was bound to a Plank, ript up alive, and had his Bowels firſt, and afterwards his Heart thrown into the Fire; his Head was fixed on a Pole, and his Quarters diſtributed into the chief Towns of the Kingdom. *Robert Graham*, his Kinſman, was carried through the City in a Cart, with his Hand nail'd to a Gallows, the Executioner in the mean time running burning Irons into all the fleſhy Parts of his Body, and then he was quarter'd as the former, ſays *Buchanan.* All this was the effect of that *Concubinage*, which Mr. *Butler* tells us was ſo happy; ſo that inſtead of Concubinages preventing the Ruine of Royal Families, I have turn'd

his own Instance upon him, to prove, that it well nigh endanger'd the Ruin of our own Royal Family, which is the most antient in the Western World; or perhaps for what's known in the whole Universe. And so far is our Author's Assertion from being true, that all Histories, Sacred and Prophane, abound with Instances of Families and Nations being ruin'd by Concubinage, and other sorts of Whoredom. For the Proof of which, I must again refer the Reader to that Book call'd, *God's Judgments upon Whoring*, where the Instances are none of 'em taken from Romances, as those in the Book, call'd, *God's Revenge against Adultery and Murder*; but from approved Histories; and may be of very good use to be read by the Youth of this Debauch'd Age.

His Proposal of Concubinage, as a Remedy against Whoredome and Adultery, is wholly ridiculous, and contrary to the Experience of all Eyes. The *Jews* were as guilty of those Crimes as any People in the World, notwithstanding their Use of Concubines. Nay,

David

David himſelf, a Man according to God's own Heart, did not find this a ſufficient Remedy. The Prophets are full of Complaints againſt the *Jews*, *for aſſembling by Troops in the Harlot's Houſes*, and *Neighing every one after his Neighbours Wife*, Jer. Chapters 3. & 5. In his 23d. he complains, that *the Land is full of Adultery*; and it ſeems they had ſuch Prieſts and Prophets too as Mr. *Butler*; for in the 14th. Verſe he ſays, *I have ſeen alſo in the Prophets of Jeruſalem an horrible thing; they commit Adultery, and walk in Lies; they ſtrengthen alſo the Hands of the Evil Doers, that none of them doth return from his Wickedneſs*: Exactly Mr. *Butler*'s Practice. *Solomon* in the 7th. of the *Proverbs*, gives us a Parabolical Repreſentation of the Nightwalkers, and ſtroling Whoremongers & Whores of his time, tho there's no doubt but his Subjects indulged themſelves in Herds of Concubines, according to his Example; yet he tells us, *That at the Window of his Houſe he look'd through his Caſement, and beheld among the ſimple ones* (Cauſe enough

to

to make our witty Debauchees fall out with the Bible, to call them Simpletons) *a young Man, void of Underſtanding, paſſing through the Street, near her Corner; and he went the way to her Houſe in the twilight in the Evening, in the black and dark Night, and behold there met him a Woman, with the Attire of an Harlot, and ſubtil of Heart, ſo ſhe caught him, and kiſſed him, and with an impudent Face ſaid unto him, This day have* I *paid my Vows,* (or I have juſt been at Church, and come from Prayers) *therefore came I forth to meet thee diligently to ſeek thy Face, and I have found thee,* &c. *He goeth after her ſtraightway, as an Ox goeth to the Slaughter, or as a Fool to the Correction of the Stocks, till a Dart ſtrike through his Liver,* &c.

So that Mr. *Butler* might as well have propoſed the breaking down of Dikes and Banks, to prevent Inundations, as Concubinage to prevent Whoredom. The practice of all Nations where it is allow'd is ſufficient to con-

convince him of his Miſtake. Who are more abominably Luſtful than the *Turks*, and yet they allow Poligamy? and indeed the Reaſon is plain, why it ſhould be ſo. There's too much Truth in our *Engliſh* Proverb, *Once a Whore, and always a Whore*, & it will hold as well of the other Sex. Let once a Man prove unfaithful to the Wife of his Youth, whom he married in the Vigor and Strength of Affection, it will be found that it is not one or two Concubines that ſhall ſerve him. We find by Divine Record, that it was ſo among the *Iſraelites*; and Hiſtory and Experience ſhews, that it hath always been ſo amongſt other Nations.

Our Author's Propoſal is much like *Lycurgus*'s Laws, that he propoſed to the *Spartans* for a Community of Women; which ſo long as they were obſerv'd, ſays *Plutarch* in his Life, the Women were far from that *Scandalous Liberty*, that they were afterwards accus'd of, and yet one of theſe Ordinances was, *That their Children ſhould not be begot by the firſt Commers* (that is their

their Husbands) *but the beſt Men that could be found*, as if there could be any thing more Scandalous: So that Mr. *Butler*'s Propoſal, if put in practice, would juſt ſave us from Whoredom and Adultery, as much as *Lycurgus*'s Laws ſav'd the *Lacedemonians*, of whom *Geradas* ſaid, *That it was as impoſſible to find an Adulterer in* Sparta, *as to find a Bull with a Neck ſo long, that he could ſtand on one ſide of a Mountain, and drink of a River on the other ſide*, which could have no other Meaning, if *Lycurgus*'s Laws were obſerv'd, than that Adultery was ſo common among the *Spartans*, that it had loſt its Name; and ſo they knew not what was call'd ſo.

There's no thinking Man but will eaſily be convinc'd, that the Natural Reſult of Concubinage muſt needs be Whoredom. All thoſe who obſerve the Courſe of Nature in the Generation and Production of Mankind, allow that the number of Males and Females born, is upon the Matter equal; and the ſame may be obſerv'd in our Weekly Bills. I ſhall only inſtance the General

Bill

Bill for the Year 1697. wherein we find 8062 Males baptized, and but 7767 Females, ſo that the Majority on the ſide of the Males, is 255, to which we ſhall add 293 Women dead in Childbed, which is a Diſtemper Women are only obnoxious to, and being Natural and Conſtant, will go far towards a Ballance for the Numbers of Men ſlain now and then by War, eſpecially if we conſider that the Widows and Female Infants chiefly, of ſuch as are ſlain in Battle, have their Lives many times ſhortned for want of one to take care of 'em; and by being expos'd to hard Labour, and ſhifts for a Livelihood. So that if Concubinage ſhould be allow'd, it follows of Neceſſity that all Men could not be ſupplied, which would certainly occaſion their breaking in upon one anothers Properties, and abundance of Confuſion and Blood-ſhed.

In the next place it infalliby hinders Propagation; for ſeeing the Numbers of Men and Women are upon the matter equal by the Courſe of Nativity, it's an Evidence that the God of Nature

ture design'd no more but one Woman for one Man at a time, that there were nothing to be said for it from the Scriptures. And that Concubinaries hinder Propagation; not only by Engrossing two, three, or more Women to themselves, by which they deprive other Men of having any, but also by being unable to perform Conjugal Duties to so many at a time, so that they lose their Teeming Season, is demonstrable thus; and we may appeal to common Experience for the Truth of it, *viz.* That when two Persons are married together of equal Years, and proportionable Strength, it's found that they are sufficient to satisfie one another, if Sickness or some other Accident don't prevent it; and they are generally most prolifick, and their Children most robust and healthful; and therefore it were to be wish'd that Christian Magistrates and Nations concern'd themselves more to have good Laws made for encouraging Marriage, & preventing Matches of unsuitable Years; and finding some Expedient to obviate

those

those Obstructions of Marriages, which are many times occasion'd by waiting for Matches of equal Quality and Fortune. If such a Method were taken, abundance of Uncleanness might be prevented, more People would be propagated, and the Dishonour of Families of Quality provided against, which happens but too too often, sometimes by Fornication, and sometimes by their Daughters throwing themselves away upon unworthy Fellows. Therefore it were Requisite there should be Laws made for bestowing young People in Marriage assoon as they come to be Marriageable, and likewise to provide against the general Uncleanness that reigns amongst Seamen.

But to return from this Digression, seeing Nature and Experience teaches us, that one Woman of proportionable Years is sufficient to satisfie a Man, it's impossible that one Man can ordinarily satisfie two or more Women, and by consequence lays them under Tentations to satisfie themselves some other way, which it's evident they generally do.

do. Nature it self teaches Men to abhor a Rival in the Marriage-Bed; and *Solomon* tells us, that Jealousie is the Rage of a Man, why then should we not think that it is the same with Women? Scripture and History inform us that Co-wives, or Wives and Concubines, could never agree. *Sarah* and *Hagar*, *Rachel* and *Leah*, *Annah* and *Penninah*, are Instances of it in Families, where the Fear of God prevail'd, and was carefully taught. Besides, it is impossible that a Man can love them equally, and the Party neglected will always be uneasie, which must unavoidably occasion continual Jars and Discords, both betwixt the different Wives, and the Off-spring of those Wives. Thus *Leah* complains that her Sister had bereft her of her Husband, and was forced to purchase his due Benevolence, with her Son's Mandrakes. And thus *Joseph*'s Brethren could not endure him, because he was one of the Beloved Sons of the Beloved Wife. It's needless to instance in any more; we have just now seen a Contexture of

Tragical Murders, &c: occasion'd by *Concubinage* in the Family of the *Stuarts*, and it's not many Years, since a Son of Concubinage of that same Family, cost this Kingdom abundance of Lives. Then certainly God nor Nature can never be the Authors or Institutors of Concubinage, which always was, and for ever must be attended, with such dismal Consequences.

It is also worth our Observation that Histories are full of Instances of Concubines, becoming enamour'don, or being defiled by the Sons of their own Husbands. Thus *Bilhah* by *Judah*, *David*'s Concubines by *Absalom*, *Fausta* on *Constantine the Great*'s Son, &c: the Reason of which is plain, that it being impossible for one Man to satisfie the Desires of many Women; they must necessarily burn, and lay hold of every Opportunity, to quench their Flame, and many times commit Crimes against Nature, rather than not have it effected.

It deserves likewise to be consider'd, that tho it obstructs Propagation in general,

neral, yet it many times increaſes particular Families to that degree, that it is impoſſible for the Father to provide for them. And therefore if he be worſe than an Infidel in the Apoſtle's Senſe, who does not provide for his own Family, he muſt be doubly worſe, who takes ſuch a Courſe, as renders it impoſſible for him to provide for them. And I ſuppoſe Mr. *Butler* is ſenſible enough of his Impoverishment, by his *Poligamy*, (which is the uſual Reward of Whoredom) and needs not go out of his own Family, for Inſtances of Jarring Wives, and quarrelling Children, whom he has made himſelf uncapable to provide for. Yet ſo Kind and Good-natur'd a Man he is, that he propoſes *Concubinage*, to prevent the Ruine of other Families, which has actually ruin'd his own. This is right Devil-like, who tempted our firſt Parents to do that which had ruin'd himſelf; and I muſt needs tell Mr. *Butler*, that in this he acts more like a Preacher of *Sodom*, than a Preacher of Righteouſneſs.

Let us suppose that the Pious and Learned Statesmen of these Realms should follow his Advice, and get a Law enacted for *Concubinage*. We should quickly see such Pious Effects of his Pious Advice, as those I have already mention'd, and many more; as Grave Matrons, who brought Estates to their Husbands, and have blessed them with a hopeful Off-spring, turn'd out of their Husband's Beds, and young sprightly Girls supplying their place; and so the good old Woman and her Off-spring must be neglected, and the young Concubine and her Bantlings dandled. O! what a wonderful Pious Harmony this would make in the Ears of the Nation! And I suppose that Mr. *Butler* would, in this Case, quickly have such another Peal rung in his Ears by *Mary Tomkins*, as now he has by *Martha Perkins*, and then he would think it a compleat Rejoynder to tell her, that he might as well hugg a young Wench, as old *David* hugg'd young *Abishag*. But I would have him to remember the Saying of his old Brother Lecher *Ovid*, *Turpe Senilis*

nilis Amor. I must beg the *Reader*'s Pardon, for writing such Stuff, and desire them to consider what an Effronted Author I have to deal with, that dares to preach up *Concubinage* to three Nations, almost drown'd already by a Deluge of Uncleanness, let out upon them in the late Reigns.

I dare venture to say, that such Fathers as have given good Estates with their Daughters, would take it very unkindly to have them turn'd out of their Beds, and their Grand-children expos'd to the World, to make room for their Maids, or any other Misses, and their Brats. I dare also presume that Pious Fathers would be very sorry to see their hopeful Sons, and Heirs to their Estates, betake themselves to Kennels of Concubines, and squander their Ancient Paternal Estates among a Spurious Offspring. It's not to be doubted but Pious Matrons would grieve at the Heart, to have their beloved Daughters exposed to the Inconvenience of having but an Husband by halves, and liable to be turn'd out by the next handsome Face.

There's no question to be made but our Pious Statesmen would think it the greatest Calamity that could befall the Nation, to have its ancient Honour so much debased, as it must necessarily be by a Spurious Brood, and therefore none of 'em, I hope, will blame me for treating Mr. *Butler* thus, seeing all these are the Natural Consequences of his Beastly Proposal.

And I am very well satisfied, that no Man, who has any Regard to the Christian Religion, will think that such an Author ought to be treated softly, who throws so much Dirt upon our Blessed Saviour's Conception and Birth, as to compare it with any thing Humane, and to ask such Blasphemous Questions as those, *P.* 32. *Whether God Almighty ever does any thing Ordinarily or Extraordinarily which he forbids us to do? or whether our Saviour's Conception and Birth were stain'd with Fornication or Incontinency, because perform'd out of Marriage?* Such Questions from a *Jew* or a *Turk* might be expected; but out of the Mouth of a Preacher of the Gospel

are

are unpardonable. Did not the Impudent Man know that our Saviour's Body was form'd by the Power of the Holy Ghoſt, in a Super-natural Manner, without any ſtain of Humane Corruption? Was there any thing in that which look'd like the Breach of Divine or Humane Law, as there is in the Caſe now in Queſtion. I pray God that this Blaſphemy may be forgiven him; but the thought is ſo Extravagant and Impious, that it looks as if he were Judicially given up of God to the Luſts of his own Heart.

His Inſtance, that *Solomon* had fail'd of that Royal Race, whence our Bleſſed Saviour deſcended, had it not been for *Concubinage*, is much of the ſame Nature; does not our Author know, that he who was able of the Stones to raiſe up Children to *Abraham*, could have raiſed up a Seed to *David* without *Concubinage?* And that does not at all import any thing of God's allowing of *Concubinage*, more than he does of Adultery and Inceſt, which he hath expreſly forbid, as I have ſhew'd already. But,

beſides,

beſides, I ſhall turn his Inſtance againſt himſelf thus; That had not *Solomon* exhauſted his Strength by *Concubinage*, he might have left Lawful Iſſue enough behind him, and therefore it was his *Concubinage* that endanger'd the failure of the Royal Line; And thus *Saul* had four Sons by *Ahinoam* one Wife, when *Solomon* of a Thouſand Wives and Concubines had but one Son.

His Inſtance of *Alexander*, King of *Scotland*, is falſe; for he left a Grandchild behind him, who was Heireſs to his Crown; but ſhe dying before Marriage, the Competition betwixt the next Heirs happen'd, who would never have yielded to the Son of a Concubine. And the Parliament of *Scotland* afterwards found out a better and more honourable Expedient than Mr *Butler's*, *viz.* that any future Controverſie about the ſucceſſion ſhould be determin'd by themſelves, as may be ſeen in *Buchanan's Hiſtory*; and it is not very long ſince the Parliaments of both *Nations* had a bleſſed Opportunity of ſettling a diſputed Succeſſion, without Mr. *Butler's* Expedient.

Then

Then as to his Inſtance of *Richard* the II. any Body that has read that Hiſtory knows, that the War began in his own time; not becauſe he wanted Iſſue, but becauſe he unjuſtly ſeiz'd the Duke of *Lancaſter*'s Eſtate, and deſign'd to baniſh his Son for ever; who landed in *England* when *Richard* was in *Ireland*, and left the Duke of *York*, his Uncle, to govern in his Abſence.

But the Nation was ſo much diſpleas'd with *Richard*, that the Duke of *York* was not able to reſiſt the Duke of *Lancaſter*, ſo that the Nation in Parliament charg'd *Richard* with the Breach of his Coronation Oath in 32 Articles, oblig'd him to reſign the Crown to the Duke of *Lancaſter*, who came to the Poſſeſſion of the Throne that way, before *Richard* was murder'd. So that it was not his want of Iſſue which began that War, nor the want of Lineal Heirs, the Poſterity of *Lionel*, Duke of *Clarence*, having a Right precedent to that of the Duke of *Lancaſter*. But the Parliament laid their Claim aſide, as in all probability they would have done that of his

Son's, if he had left any, considering the prevailing Interest and Victorious Arms of the Duke of *Lancaster*; but Mr. *Butler* is much such another Historian as he is a Divine. And now let him see to it whether he hath sufficiently vindicated his Bedding with *Mary Tomkins* or Concubinage in general, by those or any other Instances.

But because Mr. *Butler* shall have all the fair Dealing imaginable, I shall take Notice of a Text, quoted by those of his Opinion, to prove their Point, which it's like he has forgot, *viz.* Deut. 21. 15. *If a Man have two Wives, one beloved, and another hated, and they have born him Children, both the beloved, and the hated, and if the first-born Son be hers that was hated; He may not make the Son of the beloved first-born, before the Son of the hated, which is indeed first born.* This I quote now, lest it should be applied by him or others afterwards against what I have already said; and the Answer is as follows.

1. *Moses* here acts the part of a Political Law-giver, but not of a Spiritual Doctor

Doctor; And *Poligamy* being conniv'd at in the *Jews* at that time, He lays down Rules, to prevent Injuſtice to the Children of the leaſt-beloved Wife.

2. It's plain from hence, that *Poligamy* diſtracts the Affections of the Husband, and naturally occaſions Injuſtice to ſome of his Offſpring, which muſt needs cauſe Hatred, Contention, and all manner of Confuſion in a Family, elſe *Moſes* would not have here provided againſt it.

3. That the Words, *the Son of her that was hated*, would ſeem to imply, that both the Wives were not alive together; and then it makes nothing for *Poligamy*.

4. This cannot be ſuppoſed to be any thing at moſt but a meer Permiſſion of the thing, becauſe it is contrary to the Law againſt taking two Wives, *Levit.* 18. 18. which the *Karai* or *Jews* that adhere to the Scriptures, underſtand to be clearly prohibited by that Text.

5. Our Saviour and his Apoſtles, *Mat.* 19. and 15 and 1 *Cor.* 6. 16. and 7. 2. which I have taken Notice of already,

ſay, that *Poligamy* was forbidden; and ſeeing they ſay, Let every Man have his own Wife, and every Woman her own Husband, all that Liberty which was granted to, or aſſumed by the *Patriarchs*, is taken away.

6. The *Chaldee* Paraphraſt underſtands that Text, *Levit.* 18. 18. to be againſt *Poligamy*, and ſays that was the Reaſon why *Ruth*'s Kinſman, *Ruth.* 4. 6. refuſed to marry *Ruth*, becauſe he had a Wife before; and that to marry another would break the Peace of his Family, divide his Eſtate, and occaſion Diſcords amongſt the Children of the two Wives.

7. It is not like, that God would allow two Wives to the *Iſraelites*, by a Law, which ſome of the better *Heathens* diſapprov'd, as may be ſeen in *Phocylides* and *Euripides*; and *Dioclesian* made a Law againſt it, as may be ſeen, *Cod. Lib.* 5. *Tit.* 5. *Leg.* 2.

8. *Poligamy* or *Concubinage* is againſt the Apoſtle's Prohibition of Married Perſons defrauding one another, it being impoſſible for one Man ordinarily to ſatisfie

tisfie more than one Woman; ſo that to marry more than one, expoſes them to the Danger of *Satan*'s Tentation for their Incontinence; of which, *Bilhah* and *David*'s Concubines, *&c.* are ſad Inſtances.

9. The Apoſtle could not ſay, Let every Woman have her own or proper Husband ἴδιον ἄνδρα if he allowed *Concubinage*, for then he ſhould be common to two or more.

10. That which is made one Fleſh with the Body, cannot be made a Member of another Body; therefore a Man who is one Fleſh with his Wife, cannot be one Fleſh alſo with another in a Lawful Senſe; for there can be no Union where there is a Diviſion, as in this Caſe there muſt be.

11. If *Concubinage* were allow'd, Marriage could be no proper Reſemblance of the Union betwixt Chriſt & his Church; for Chriſt has but one Church, whereas in that Caſe a Man ſhould have more than one Wife.

Some again object, that *ſeeing the Apoſtle preſcribes, that he who was to be choſen*

chosen Bishop, should be the Husband of one Wife, 1 Tim. 3. 2. *Poligamy was allowed in others.* To which 'tis answer'd that many of the *Jews* and *Gentiles* in those times had two Wives. And therefore it's supposed they were tolerated to keep them during Life, or at least till they were confirm'd in the Faith; but it would have been scandalous to have had such for Ministers or Bishops.

2, The Law of *Monogamy* being reviv'd by Christ, and Preach'd up by this same Apostle elsewhere, he cannot be imagin'd to allow it here.

3. Another Reason of this Injunction is suppos'd to be, that it would have been accounted scandalous in Christian Bishops, to come short of the Heathen Priests in Continency, who were forbid to have two Wives, as may be seen in *Plutarch*, and other Authors.

4. It cannot be thought that any such thing was allow'd in the ancient Church, when to marry twice was by them so much scrupled, that some think the Apostle forbids such Persons here to be chosen Bishops.

5. *Beza*

5. *Beza* on the Place tells us, that not only Bigamy and Poligamy were forbid by the Ancient Canons, but likewise the Marriage of such Persons as had rashly divorc'd their Wives. And Dr. *Hammond* on the Place quotes *Theophilact* and *Athenagoras* for it; That Marriage after Divorce was forbidden to the Antient Christians. So falsly has Mr. *Butler* alledged the Customs of the *Primitive Church*, to defend his Practice.

I shall conclude with what *Willet* says on 1 *Sam.* 25. that if it seems strange that the *Patriarchs* should so long continue in an Error unreform'd; The like Instance is given, *Nehem.* 8. 17. where the People of *Israel* are said not to have kept the Feast of Tabernacles, from *Joshua*'s time till then, by the space almost of 1000 Years. But tho God winked at those times of Ignorance, he now calleth all Men to repent; and the worst I wish Mr. *Butler* is, that he would glorifie God, by confessing his Sin, and taking Shame upon himself, and not add Fuel to those Flames of Uncleanness, which have well-nigh ruin'd the Nation already, and will bring down the Flames of Divine Vengeance upon us, if we don't Repent and Reform.

F I N I S.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

1. GOD's Judgments against Whoring. Being an Essay to a General History of it, from the Creation of the World to the Reign of *Augustulus*, (which, according to common Computation, is 5190 Years) and from thence down to the present Year 1697. Being a Collection of the most Remarkable Instances of Uncleanness, that are to be found in Sacred or Prophane History, during that time; with Observations thereon. Pr. 3*s*. 6*d*.

2. The Secret History of *White-Hall*, from the Restoration of King *Charles* II. down to the Abdication of the late King *James*. Writ at the Request of a Noble Lord, and Convey'd to him in Letters, by ——— late Secretary, Interpreter to the Marquis of *Louvois*; who, by that Means, had the Perusal of all the Private Minutes between *England* and *France* for many Years. The whole consisting of Secret Memoirs, which have hitherto lain conceal'd, as not being discoverable by any other Hand. Published from the Original Papers, by *D. Jones*, Gent. Price 5 *s*.

3. By the same Author, A Continuation of the Secret History of *White-Hall*, from the Abdication of the late King *James*, in 1688. to the year 1696. Together with the Tragical History of the *Stuarts*, from the first Rise of that Family, in the Year 1068. down to the Death of her Late Majesty, Queen *Mary*, of Blessed Memory. Price 5 *s*.

All Sold by *R. Baldwin*, in *Warwick-Lane*.

355293